

DICTIONARY OF
AMERICAN HISTORY

VOLUME IV

DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN HISTORY

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

Editor in Chief

R. V. COLEMAN

Managing Editor



VOLUME IV

SECOND EDITION
REVISED

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

COPYRIGHT, 1940, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

Printed in the United States of America
12 55

*All rights reserved. No part of this book
may be reproduced in any form without
the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons*

Advisory Council

Randolph G. Adams

Director, William L. Clements Library of American History, University of Michigan

Dixon Ryan Fox

President, Union College; President, New York State Historical Association

Paul M. Angle

Librarian, Illinois State Historical Library

Douglas Southall Freeman

Editor, The Richmond News Leader; President, Southern Historical Society

Eugene C. Barker

Professor of History, University of Texas

Wm. Starr Myers

Professor of Politics, Princeton University

Theodore C. Blegen

Professor of American History, University of Minnesota

Allan Nevins

Professor of History, Columbia University

Herbert E. Bolton

Sather Professor of History; Director of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley

Milo M. Quaife

Secretary, The Burton Historical Collection, Detroit

Julian P. Boyd

Librarian, Princeton University

William W. Sweet

Professor of the History of American Christianity, University of Chicago

Solon J. Buck

Director of Publications, The National Archives

Robert W. G. Vail

Director, New York State Library

Carl L. Cannon

Associate in Bibliography, Brown University Library

Malcolm G. Wyer

Librarian, Denver Public Library; Director of Libraries, University of Denver

Christopher B. Coleman

Secretary, Indiana Historical Society

DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Mobile, Ala. — Ryswick, The Peace of

Mobile, Ala. The first settlement was a French fort built by Bienville in 1702. At the close of the French and Indian War^w the colony passed into the hands of the British, who ceded it to Spain in 1783. Mobile remained a Spanish city until 1813. In that year the United States Army, under the command of Gen. Wilkinson, took possession of the city, alleging that it was being used as a base by British vessels in the War of 1812 (*see* Mobile Seized).

Mobile was one of the most important Confederate ports during the Civil War. It was strongly fortified and was much used by blockade runners^w. Admiral Farragut closed the port in the battle of Mobile Bay^w (Aug. 5, 1864), but the city did not fall into the hands of Union troops until April 12, 1865.

[A. B. Moore, *History of Alabama.*]

HALLIE FARMER

Mobile Act, THE. During a dispute with Spain over the boundaries of West Florida^w, Congress, at President Jefferson's insistence, passed an act (Feb. 24, 1804) directing that the territories ceded by France in the Louisiana Treaty of 1803, "and also all the navigable waters, rivers, creeks, bays, and inlets, *lying within the United States*, shall be annexed to the Mississippi District. . . ." The words which we have italicized avoided a precise boundary, and thus left it to executive action to determine just what territory should be annexed. Spain had contended, with much force, that there was no territory on the Gulf of Mexico lying within the United States east of the Mississippi River. In proclaiming the annexation Jefferson repeated the latitudinarian but ambiguous language of the act and thus evaded the issue. The region (eastward from the Mississippi to the Perdido River^w, and bordering on the Gulf, but not including Mobile) was not actu-

ally occupied by the United States until 1810 (*see* West Florida, Annexation of).

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States.*]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Mobile Bay, Battle of (1864). On Aug. 5, a Union fleet of four monitors and fourteen wooden vessels of war, commanded by Admiral David G. Farragut, forced an entrance into Mobile Bay through a narrow passage protected by mines, by Fort Morgan and by the ironclad *Tennessee*^w and three small wooden gunboats, commanded by Admiral Franklin Buchanan. The Federal monitor *Tecumseh* was sunk by a mine; "Damn the torpedoes!"^w cried Farragut, as his *Hartford*^w took the lead. All his vessels eventually reached the Bay, though some were injured by Fort Morgan and the *Tennessee*. Then followed a terrific battle between the *Tennessee* and the whole Union fleet. Three of the larger wooden vessels were injured, but the powerful guns of the three monitors finally forced the ironclad to surrender. Farragut lost 52 killed, 93 drowned and 170 wounded. Buchanan lost 12 killed and 20 wounded. Fort Morgan surrendered on Aug. 23, and the city of Mobile^w was completely blockaded.

[A. T. Mahan, *Admiral Farragut*; C. L. Lewis, *Admiral Franklin Buchanan.*]

CHARLES LEE LEWIS

Mobile Seized (1813). At the commencement of the War of 1812^w, Mobile was in the possession of Spain. The United States had long coveted the port (*see* Mobile Act) and when the English navy began using it as a base for attacking the United States, President Madison ordered Gen. Wilkinson, commanding the United States forces at New Orleans, to capture the city. The Spanish commander had few soldiers at his command and surrendered to avoid bloodshed, although he protested against the invasion of

Spanish territory by the United States in time of peace. The town passed into the possession of the United States, April 13, 1813 (*see* West Florida, Annexation of).

[Peter Joseph Hamilton, *Mobile under Five Flags.*]
HALLIE FARMER

Mobile Treaties (1784). *See* Spanish-Indian Relations.

Mobilization, in its broadest sense, includes all steps necessary to convert a nation from its normal peacetime status to one in which its man power and material resources can be devoted to waging war. To achieve this objective, a practicable mobilization plan provides co-ordinated action of all governmental departments and agencies so that every human and material resource may be made quickly available. Two normal factors will always be considered, (a) provision for assembly, equipping, housing and training of an adequate fighting force, and (b) the measure of that force in terms of the strategical situation presented.

For our Indian wars no mobilization problem was presented. They were either fought by our Regular Army (*see* Army, United States) units or by locally called volunteers. But, in all other wars in which we have engaged, the machinery of mobilization has always been a vexatious problem. We have tried volunteering, conscription, bounties and calling of state militia⁹⁹ into national service. Throughout our struggles to achieve something practical in this direction we have been hampered by a certain percentage of our population who fondly imagine that "A million men will spring to arms overnight in an emergency." These folk do not say from whence shall come the arms, equipment, clothing, shelter and, finally, the training to convert these patriotic volunteers into trained and efficient fighting men.

For the Revolution we depended upon calling into service the militia of the several colonies. Military experience, born of stern necessity, was widespread and the existing militia system provided the means for disseminating and employing this experience. Militia men were divided into two classes, the first, Minutemen⁹⁹, providing an immediate force, the second, a continuing force. The problem was not how to mobilize but how to maintain a force once assembled. The lack of a strong central government created sad havoc for Gen. Washington. Varying enlistment periods, restrictions as to area in which certain troops could or would serve, absence of uniformity in pay—a thousand and one factors mitigated against the maintenance of the Revolutionary Army⁹⁹.

For the Mexican War the President, in spite of warnings, elected to mobilize by the volunteer system. From every section of the country, to the tune of "Come all ye gallant volunteers," or to the battle cry of "Ho, for the halls of Montezuma," raw material poured in, officered at least in one instance by a brigadier general who proposed to lead the troops from his horse-drawn buggy.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, small units of our Regular Army were scattered throughout the country, patrolling borders, policing, and fighting Indians (*see* Army on the Frontier). The militia existed in name only. Military efficacy was measurable only in the value of our Regular troops, and, immediately, this value was halved, North against South. The North held the greater number of factory towns for the production of equipment and munitions; the South had a human element advantage in the zeal of its people for a "cause."

The Confederate President on March 15, 1861, moved first to mobilize, calling for 100,000 volunteers within the Southern states, to be responsible to the secretary of war, L. P. Walker (*see* Army, Confederate). The Federal Government waited supinely for the outbreak of hostilities, seeking solution through futile compromises. Finally, President Lincoln, having no considerable Regular Army in sight, reverted to the old law of 1795 and, in desperation, turned to the state militias, calling (April 15, 1861) for 75,000 volunteers to serve three months. Nothing constructive had been learned since the Revolution concerning mobilization and the volunteer system proved inadequate. Later draft riots and substitute⁹⁹ hiring scandals are matters of history.

The volunteer system of 1861 repeated itself during the Spanish-American War with most of the old mistakes and some new ones; the latter, in one instance so glaring as to bring about congressional investigation of firms supplying inferior food to troops mobilized in training camps (*see* Embalmed Beef). Disjointed and impractical legislation was jammed through Congress with hectic results.

In 1916 Congress passed the National Defense Act⁹⁹, our first definite, practical step as a nation to co-ordinate all mobilization machinery. But we lagged in doing very much after the act was passed. When we entered the World War our mobilization problem was met in three steps, (1) expansion to full war strength was ordered for the Regular Army, (2) the entire National Guard⁹⁹ was called into Federal service and (3) the Selective Service Act (*see* Draft) was passed to raise a new National Army⁹⁹. Through these

measures we expanded our army in one year from 200,000 to 4,000,000 men.

The experience gained in the World War has resulted in our present Protective Mobilization Plan, initiated within the War Department in 1937 and worked out through the co-ordinated efforts of the War Department agencies in co-operation with industrial leaders throughout the nation. This plan calls for a strong initial force for the defense of our territory—this force to come from the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves as a nucleus. Following this, new units are to be provided as needed. Coincident with the first call, industry is to begin the production of war materials of every type, following definite plans and instructions given long in advance. This plan, under constant revision and improvement as new contingencies arise, provides a practical military mobilization scheme, set up primarily for defense and ready to be put into instant use.

[*Mobilization of the Army of the United States*, prepared and published by the Engineer School, Fort Belvoir, Va.; Lt. Col. T. M. Coughlan, *Mobilization in Retrospect; Army Extension Courses—Special Text No. 226—Mobilization, U. S.*, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1934; Preparation of the American Army for the World War, an article in the *Militär Wochenblatt*, July 18, 1936; "Mobilization of Emergency Army," a lecture delivered by Maj. Gen. Henry Jervey at the General Staff College, Washington, D. C., Jan. 3, 1920; William A. Ganoe, *The History of the United States Army*; Oliver L. Spaulding, *The United States Army in War and Peace*; Justin H. Smith, *The War with Mexico*; Douglas S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee; Annual Reports of the Secretary of War.*]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Mobs and Riots. There is a significant contrast between the mob and riot scenes in America before and after the Civil War. Most of those before the war were either local or caused by questions which after the war were outmoded and almost forgotten. The Astor Place Riot of 1849⁹⁰, for example, was an attack upon an English actor by partisans of an American actor. In the far West in pioneer days, the lynching of an alleged thief or murderer was not considered as the act of a mob, but rather that of a "posse," an informal operation of justice. Most of the riots of ante-bellum years were less destructive than those after the war, and either took place in the slum districts of the larger cities, or were brought about by the denizens of those areas. It may seem strange that there were antiabolitionist riots in Northern cities, especially in New York in 1833–35, when the home of a prominent white merchant and Abolitionist⁹¹ was gutted, Negroes were beaten and slain and their homes, churches and schools destroyed. In the 1840's there were anti-

Catholic demonstrations; in 1844 churches and convents in Philadelphia and elsewhere were attacked (*see Philadelphia Riots*). Between 1840 and 1860 "Native Americans" banded to fight "foreigners" (*see Nativism*), and even political partisans in the slums attacked each other. The battle between the Bowery Boys and Dead Rabbits, two New York East Side gangs of semipolitical character, on July 4–5, 1857, was a desperate affair, with barricades thrown up in the streets, guns, pistols and missiles used by the warriors on the ground and the housetops, and militia finally ending the affair with a large but unknown casualty list. All these enmities were forgotten in the Civil War (*see Draft Riots*), which, however, together with the Panic of 1873⁹² and other causes, implanted new and uglier antagonisms. It was after the war that the lynching⁹³ of Negroes began in the South; it was in 1877 that the first great strike and labor riots (*see Railroad Strike of 1877*) in the nation's history occurred, and the agitation against the Chinese gathered force, bringing attacks upon them in San Francisco, Denver and elsewhere. Early in the 19th century, anti-Negro feeling flamed up in several places. In Atlanta, Sept. 22–23, 1906, political questions and assaults on white women brought on riots in which fifteen Negroes and two whites were killed and many injured. At Springfield, Ill., Aug. 14–16, 1908, six were killed and nearly all the Negroes in the city fled to other places. Negro emigration to the North was gaining momentum then and arousing resentment among Northern white workingmen. The year 1917 was one of race riots⁹⁴. In a three-day tumult at East St. Louis, 29 were killed and 300 Negro houses destroyed. There were also serious riots in Chicago (where 6000 troops were called out to quell the trouble), in Washington, New York City and elsewhere. There was also bloody fighting for other reasons between the races in Arkansas, where even the governor of the state narrowly escaped being shot.

[E. Benjamin Andrews, *History of the Last Quarter-Century in the United States, 1870–1895*; Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Bowery Days*; Louise Venable Kennedy, *The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Moccasin, from an Algonkin word for shoe, is specifically a foot covering of soft skin, with soft or hard soles. All the Indian tribes of the United States wore moccasins except a few of those in our western deserts and in parts of California. The eastern Indian moccasin had a soft sole and was often made by folding a piece of soft tanned skin up over the foot, the seams at the top. The uppers and the toes offered fields for decoration

with quills and beads. The Plains Indians preferred a moccasin with a hard sole, but decorated the uppers with attractive designs in porcupine quills and beads. There were tribal styles in shape and other unessentials which made possible the identification of tracks in soft earth. Women made the moccasins and both sexes of all ages wore them. Moccasins were adopted by the whites, universally worn by early traders and trappers and are still in use in parts of Canada and the United States. To some extent Indian models have influenced certain modern styles of shoes.

[G. Hatt, *Moccasins and Their Relation to Arctic Footwear*; *Memours of the American Anthropological Association*, Vol. 3.]

CLARK WISSLER

Modoc War, THE (1872-73), the last Indian war to affect southern Oregon and northern California, was started in 1872 when a Modoc chief known as Capt. Jack went on the warpath to resist efforts to force him and his followers to live on the reservation assigned to them. Capt. Jack commanded scarcely fifty warriors, but the lava beds centering in the Tule Lake region offered a country which was almost impenetrable to the United States troops.

Gen. Edw. R. S. Canby, commander of the troops sent to capture the Indians, and one other unarmed member of a peace commission which met the band were treacherously murdered (April 11, 1873) and other members wounded. The War Department and the Department of the Interior dealing with Indian affairs took opposing views of the struggle and worked at cross purposes. The Indians finally gave up the struggle, and Capt. Jack and three other Modoc leaders were tried by a military court and hanged on Oct. 3, 1873. The surviving tribesmen were removed to a distant reservation.

[George W. Fuller, *A History of the Pacific Northwest*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Modus Vivendi is a temporary agreement or protocol made by an executive to cover questions that will later be covered in a formal treaty. In the United States these arrangements are made by the President to meet emergencies in foreign relations where Congress has failed to act. The method was first used by Cleveland for a temporary settlement of the North Atlantic Fisheries dispute. A notable instance of this use of executive power was Theodore Roosevelt's agreement establishing a financial protectorate over the Dominican Republic.

[J. M. Mathews, *American Foreign Relations*.]

THEODORE G. GRONERT

Moffat Tunnel, THE (1923-27), is the culmination of sixty years' effort to place Denver and Colorado upon a transcontinental rail route. Located fifty miles west of Denver it penetrates the Continental Divide 6.2 miles, reducing the distance from Denver to the Pacific coast 173 miles, saving 2400 feet in elevation for the Denver & Salt Lake (Moffat Road), previously built by David H. Moffat. Denver also utilized the tunnel to divert water for domestic use from the Pacific to the Atlantic slope.

[Edgar C. McMechen, *The Moffat Tunnel of Colorado*.]

EDGAR C. McMECHEN

Mohair. Before 1900 little was produced in the United States and the annual importation was about 1,000,000 pounds. The first Angora goats in the United States were sent in 1849 as a gift of the Sultan of Turkey to a resident of South Carolina. None remained at the close of the Civil War, and but few others were imported before the end of the 19th century. From an estimated half million in the United States before the World War, the number had increased by 1937 to six or seven million, producing about 20,000,000 pounds of mohair annually. Texas has four fifths of these, principally around Del Rio, San Angelo, Kerrville and Rock Springs where it produces more than four fifths of the mohair of the nation.

[*The Book of Texas*.]

L. W. NEWTON

Mohave Indians, THE, were a warlike Yuman tribe living on the Colorado River above Williams Fork. First visited by a Spaniard, Father Garcés, in 1776, they are frequently mentioned in the Spanish annals of California. The first Americans to contact them were fur men, Jedediah Smith, 1826, Kit Carson, 1829. Hostile to emigrants, the Mohaves were subdued in 1858, and in 1865 placed on a reservation in Arizona where the tribal remnant still lives.

[H. H. Bancroft, *Arizona and New Mexico*.]

J. G. SMITH

Mohawk and Hudson Railroad, THE, was chartered by the State of New York in 1826, started in 1830 and opened in 1831. Though another road had been chartered before it and other roads constructed before it, its charter was the first under which a railroad was built in the United States. It connected Albany with Schenectady. In 1853 it was joined with other short lines between Albany and Buffalo to become the New York Central Railroad.

[H. U. Faulkner, *American Economic History*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Mohawk Indians, THE, were the most eastwardly division of the Iroquois Confederation⁹⁹, as late as 1755 occupying a large portion of the Mohawk Valley⁹⁹ in New York. In 1650 they were estimated to number 5000 but ten years later these figures were reduced to 2500. Seven villages were reported in 1644, reduced to five in 1677. The Mohawks bore the brunt of the early conflict with the French and quickly allied themselves with the English, whose cause they espoused in the American Revolution. The surviving groups now live in Ontario, with a few hundred near Hogansburg, N. Y.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*.]

ARTHUR C. PARKER

Mohawk Valley, the northern gateway to the West, was the only natural east-west passage through the Appalachian barrier and hence prized by both Indians and whites from earliest times. Along this route from the earliest days of the Dutch period (*see* New Netherland) the fur trade⁹⁹ moved to Albany—a trade which became increasingly dependent upon the Iroquoian⁹⁹ conquests in the West. Inevitably there was a clash with the interests of the French in Canada. In the protection of the New York frontier and the maintenance of the Iroquois alliance, which became of necessity cardinal objectives of English policy, control of the Mohawk Valley was essential. Both the French and English claimed the Iroquois as subjects. In 1701, however, the Iroquois signed a treaty (*see* Iroquois Beaver Land Deed) deeding their hunting grounds to the King of England, thus, in effect, placing themselves under the protection of the British, and in 1713 by the Treaty of Utrecht⁹⁹ the suzerainty of England over the Iroquois was acknowledged by the French. This protection was to be used, first by the English and later by the State of New York as a basis for claiming the western lands conquered by the Iroquois. During the period of the colonial wars the valley settlements suffered cruelly from French and Indian raids (*see* Schenectady). The Iroquois wavered in their alliance, and only the influence of Sir William Johnson held them to the English. Again in the American Revolution the strategic importance of the valley was recognized. In 1777 St. Leger planned to take the valley on his way to Albany (*see* Burgoyne's Invasion) but was checked at Oriskany and Fort Stanwix⁹⁹ on the upper Mohawk and forced to retreat.

A part of the only continuous water route from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes, the valley became the natural route of turnpikes, railroads, canals, auto highways and airplanes⁹⁹. A stream

of immigration moved through the valley westward with the opening of the Erie Canal⁹⁹ in 1825; the products of Midwestern states were carried to eastern markets; and eastern goods found sale in the West.

[Nelson Greene, *History of the Mohawk Valley*.]

A. C. FLICK

Mohegan Case, THE, involving a century of protracted litigation, arose from a deed in 1640 of Uncas, Mohegan chief, to the colony of Connecticut, conveying virtually the whole Indian country, including the north parish of New London and the townships of Windham, Colchester, Lynne and Hebron, for a paltry consideration. The Indians later looked upon this as merely constituting a right of pre-emption. In 1659 the famous Norwich tract was deeded by Uncas to Capt. John Mason and others. This the Indians and Mason's descendants claimed merely set up a trusteeship in their behalf. But as Mason was agent for the colony, Connecticut maintained that he had obtained the deed to eliminate whatever remaining title to the lands the Mohegans might have possessed. Further sales of the area known as the Mohegan Hunting Grounds were made by Uncas' son. A royal commission set up in 1703 by Queen Anne decided that Connecticut should restore the Mohegans in possession of all the lands they had at the time of Uncas' death. But in 1715 a commission appointed by the General Assembly decided nearly all claims in favor of the colony. Similar findings were returned by a royal commission of review in 1738, which virtually repealed the 1703 decision. This was set aside on appeal, but a new commission in 1743 sustained the ruling substantially upholding the Uncas deed. An appeal to the king in council finally settled the issue in favor of the colony as late as 1773.

[G. A. Washburne, *Imperial Control of the Administration of Justice in the Thirteen American Colonies, 1684-1776*; F. Morgan, ed., *Connecticut as Colony and State*, I, ch. XVI.]

RICHARD B. MORRIS

Mohegan Indians, THE, were an Algonkian tribe whose proper territory lay along the Thames River in Connecticut to a point eight or ten miles from the Massachusetts line, and whose claims of conquest extended north and east into Massachusetts and Rhode Island. After the destruction of the Pequots⁹⁹, the Mohegans claimed their lands (1637), for at the opening of white settlement the two tribes had formed one group under Chief Sassacus, a rebellion under Uncas having caused the separation. Uncas was favored by the English in his claims to supremacy

and after the death of King Philip^m in 1676 the Mohegans were the only well-organized tribe south of the Abnaki^m. Selling most of their lands, the Mohegans retreated to a small reservation in New London County, where a small remnant of mixed bloods continue in occupation. They never had political relations with the Mahicans^m of the Hudson River.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of the American Indians.*]

ARTHUR C. PARKER

Molasses Act, THE (1733), laid a prohibitive duty of ninepence on every gallon of rum, sixpence a gallon on molasses and five shillings a hundredweight on sugar imported from foreign colonies into his majesty's American colonies, to be paid before landing.

The act originated in the conflicting economic interests of continental and island colonies. Barbados, which was suffering from the effects of a recent hurricane, the exhaustion of her soil, the restraints of the Navigation Acts^m and a burdensome export tax, led the other British sugar colonies in petitioning Parliament that the "Bread Colonies" be prohibited from selling provisions to, or buying sugar products from, the more fertile foreign West Indies. The continental colonies had a sound economic answer, that the British West Indies could not consume all their provisions nor satisfy their demand for molasses; but the sugar colonies had the better political connections in Parliament.

Colonial smuggling^m minimized the act's effects. Although one cannot measure the exact extent of the illicit trade, it is clear that New England distilled considerably more rum^m than could have been produced from legally imported molasses. Yet it was expensive to evade officials or to procure their connivance, and the act probably served as a mildly protective tariff in favor of the British West Indies until its repeal in 1764 by the Sugar Act^m.

[G. L. Beer, *British Colonial Policy*; F. W. Pitman, *Development of British West Indies*; C. W. Taussig, *Rum, Romance and Rebellion*; W. B. Weedon, *Economic and Social History of New England.*]

LAWRENCE A. HARPER

Molasses Trade, THE, was the keystone of colonial commerce, supplying as it did a product which enabled the colonists to offset their unfavorable balance of trade with England. Except for experimental attempts to produce molasses locally from corn, the source of supply was the West Indies. It centered at first in the English sugar colonies, but by the early 18th century it shifted to the other West Indies, where it has remained ever since.

Molasses had obvious advantages for sweetening purposes, and it provided a "money cargo" almost as current as cash, but once exported from the Islands, there was surprisingly little trade in molasses as such. Its real potency came when distilled into rum^m which helped to cheat the Indian, cheer the fisherman and enslave the Negro. Most important, it served as the basis for the Triangular Trade^m in which rum sent to Africa brought Negroes to the West Indies, where they were exchanged for cash or bills of exchange^m and more molasses.

At first the trade was unrestrained except for local taxes, but in 1704 Parliament confined the exportation of molasses to England or her colonies. In 1733 the Molasses Act^m unsuccessfully attempted to eliminate trade with the foreign West Indies by prohibitive taxes, and after 1764 the Sugar Acts^m tried to raise revenue from it. Independence freed the Thirteen Colonies from such restraints, but hampered their trade with the British West Indies. Modifications of the law permitted the direct importation of molasses, but the Navigation Acts continued to limit American shipping until 1830.

[See under Molasses Act for bibliography.]

LAWRENCE A. HARPER

Molino del Rey, Battle of (Sept. 8, 1847). Believing it to contain an operating gun foundry, Scott ordered Worth to storm the "King's Mill," a stone building near the base of Chapultepec hill. Worth's tactics proved uninspired, the Mexican defense unexpectedly resolute, and it was only after a bloody initial repulse that the "Mill" was captured. The victory proved disappointingly barren, the foundry nonexistent. The heavy casualties, including valuable senior officers, temporarily depressed the army's spirits. Later the "Mill" provided cover from which Pillow assaulted Chapultepec^m.

[Justin H. Smith, *The War with Mexico*; R. S. Ripley, *The War with Mexico.*]

CHARLES WINSLOW ELLIOTT

"Molly Maguires," THE, a secret and eventually criminal society also known as the "Buckshots," "White Boys" and "Sleepers," terrorized the anthracite region of Pennsylvania from about 1865 until finally broken up in a series of sensational murder trials from 1875 to 1877.

The Molly Maguires used their power in labor disputes for the benefit of their members, and intimidated or murdered recalcitrant mine bosses and colliery superintendents.

In 1874, at the height of their power, Franklin B. Gowen, president of the Philadelphia Coal and Iron Company, determined upon their sup-

pression. A Pinkerton detective, James McParlan, posing as a counterfeiter, holder of fraudulent pension and ex-killer, established himself in the coal regions, joined the organization and rose to be secretary of his division.

After a particularly outrageous murder in 1875, one assassin was condemned to death, the first capital conviction of a Molly. In view of evidence brought out at the trial, suspicion arose that a detective was at work and quickly centered on McParlan. Evading one plot to murder him, he continued his pose for some time and then quietly withdrew. The murder prosecutions which followed were based largely on his evidence and shattered the organization forever.

[James Ford Rhodes, *The Molly Maguires*, *American Historical Review*, XV; F. P. Dewees, *The Molly Maguires*; Allan Pinkerton, *The Molly Maguires and the Detectives*; Anthony Bimba, *Molly Maguires*.]

JOHN BAKELESS

Monarchical Tendencies in the Federalist Period. Such monarchical proposals as had been secretly made, 1776-86, were blocked by the adoption of the Constitution of 1787, although "it squints towards monarchy" was charged against the Constitution, largely because it imposed no limits on re-election to the potentially powerful Presidency. Washington, unjustly criticized for imitating English monarchical procedures, was not partial to kingly government. Hamilton, favorable to monarchical institutions, loyally labored to strengthen our republic. John Adams, advocate of some monarchical principles, sturdily upheld constitutional government. "Monarchists," applied to the Federalistssm, was mainly a partisan epithet.

[L. B. Dunbar, *A Study of "Monarchical" Tendencies in the United States, from 1776 to 1801*, *University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences*, Vol. X, No. 1.]

LOUISE B. DUNBAR

Money. As in all modern nations, money in the United States has been an organic part of the nation's history. But more than in any other major nation money has been in America a subject of popular controversy and political manipulation. The colonists were without a stable currency, and they learned early the dubious arts of juggling legal tender and issuing fiat moneysm.

The opportunity presented by independence to create a sound money was bravely but ineffectually seized. The best minds of the new nation contributed to the money system set up in 1792. Generally credited to Alexander Hamilton, it was the joint creation of Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, Robert Morris, Thomas Jefferson and the first Congress of the United States. In the light of the currency knowledge of the time, it

was, in its major features, admirable. The outstanding features were a double (silver and gold) standard at a ratio of 15 to 1, a new gold dollar, a new silver dollarsm modeled on the Spanish dollarsm and, with minor departures, a purely decimal system, the first in history. Congress rejected Hamilton's excellent plan for eliminating foreign coins.

In operation the system was a failure. For a generation the expensive and unproductive mintsm was threatened with abolition by Congress, which did nothing to improve it and continued to give legal tender to foreign coins. For fifty years the American people kept accounts in shillings and pence and used Spanish coins of one fourth, one eighth and one sixteenth of the Spanish dollar. The currency void was filled by a flood of state bank notes of uncertain value, some of them without any legal sanction.

In bimetallicsm theory the system "works" when coinage ratio and bullionsm market ratio are the same. In the early 1830's a genuine attempt to reform the coinagesm and make the system work was embodied in an elaborate bill. The market ratio at the time was 15½. The bill carried this ratio. In 1834 there was rushed to passage an act which omitted all the measures for improvement and merely changed the ratio to 15.988. Such a law could have only one effect. It would stimulate gold coinage and stop all silver coinage. The major impetus behind it was, probably, the intent to obtain gold coinage at any cost, the objective of the "hard money"sm group led by Sen. T. H. Benton. But some petty gold mines had been discovered in Georgia and North Carolina, and the act was prompted also by interests behind these mines.

It put the United States on the single gold standard, in fact. The new ratio, slightly changed for technical reasons in 1837, stifled silver coinage. A growing shortage of small change reached the point in 1853 where retail trade was in a state of collapse. In that year Congress established a subsidiary or "token" silver coinage, thus making a workable gold standardsm. It was the first formal and legal subsidiary coinagesm system in history. Congress overlooked the silver dollar, nonexistent but still a bimetallic coin under the law of 1837. Congress had thus stumbled into the modern gold standard.

The excellent prospects of a stable currency after 1853 were destroyed by the Civil War, which brought the greenback era, the end of state bank issues and a new currency of National Bank notessm, absolutely uniform and safe but so inelastic in volume as to provide little aid to economic progress. For fifteen years the country,

hurt by deflation and falling prices, endured a currency of greenbacks, fractional currency⁷⁰ and inelastic bank notes. The conditions inspired an inflationary and free silver movement⁷¹ which has had political importance to the present day. The dropping of the silver dollar in 1873, falsely characterized as the "Crime of '73,"⁷² made official the gold standard which had existed in fact since 1834. The law of 1900 formally legalized the gold standard, but contradicted itself by declaring the silver dollar, which is in reality a large token coin⁷³, a standard money.

The Federal Reserve Act of 1913 created an elastic bank-note currency, the Federal Reserve note, issued by the Federal Reserve Banks to commercial banks against reserves of gold and collateral of rediscounted customers' notes. It provided for the gradual elimination of National Bank notes (*see* Federal Reserve System).

In the World War period the restrictions on Federal Reserve note issue were relaxed, and the issue was greatly expanded. A price inflation in this country (and elsewhere) was a factor in the brief depression of 1920 and culminated in the world depression of 1929. The result was a drastic reorganization of the American money system. Repudiation of the gold standard, confiscation of all gold (*see* Gold, Federal Expropriation of), nationalization of silver and the Silver Purchase Act⁷⁴ established a legal hybrid gold-silver money system and a de facto irredeemable paper money system. The Thomas Amendment⁷⁵ gave the President power to establish bimetallism or to issue \$3,000,000,000 in government notes, while the Gold Reserve Act of 1934⁷⁶ made the reserve against the paper money of the country an unavailable gold supply buried in government vaults (*see* Gold Hoards, Federal).

The evolution of the American money system has been from bimetallism through the single gold standard to what is called a "managed currency"⁷⁷ of irredeemable paper and from a state-controlled bank-note issue through a rigidly limited nationally regulated issue to a highly elastic directly manipulated issue. The measures bringing this situation about have been in part a political response to popular demand for inflation⁷⁸ and in part a surrender to pressure groups⁷⁹ demanding legislation, but in their larger aspects they were a part of the world-wide abandonment of the self-operating gold standard as a consequence of war inflation, depreciated paper money, demoralized exchanges and frantic struggles to reap trade advantage by currency debasements.

[A. B. Hepburn, *History of the Currency*; J. L. Laughlin, *History of Bimetallism*; D. R. Dewey, *Financial His-*

tory of the U. S.; N. Carothers, *Fractional Money*; F. A. Bradford, *Money and Banking*.]

NEIL CAROTHERS

Money, Purchasing Power of, is the reciprocal of the general level of prices, and changes in purchasing power can be measured by changes in an index of the price level. We have no index of the general level of all prices in the United States prior to 1875, but the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in conjunction with Warren, Pearson and Stoker, has constructed a wholesale commodity price index which runs back to pre-Revolutionary times and gives at least an approximation of changes in the value of the dollar.

The first drastic change in the dollar's purchasing power occurred in the Revolutionary War, the dollar falling from \$1.96 (1926=\$1.00) in 1775 to a low of \$0.67 in most of 1779 and 1780. Thereafter it rose to around \$1.67 and maintained a fair degree of stability until the War of 1812, when it again fell to \$0.76 in December, 1814. From 1820 on, the purchasing power of the dollar fluctuated above and below \$1.43 until the time of the Civil War when it fell to \$0.65 in August and September of 1864. From then on the trend of the purchasing power of the dollar was irregularly upward to a high of \$2.13 in 1896-97, after which a declining trend set in which carried the dollar down to about \$1.43 in 1915.

With the progress of the World War the purchasing power of the dollar again declined rapidly, reaching \$0.60 in May, 1920, from which low point it rose drastically to \$1.10 in early 1922. Thereafter it fell to \$0.99 at the end of the year and fluctuated moderately above and below \$1.00 until 1929. With the onset of the great depression (*see* Panic of 1929) the purchasing power of the dollar rose rather steadily to \$1.67 in the spring of 1933, then, following the settlement of the banking crisis⁸⁰, fell irregularly to \$1.14 in the summer of 1937, after which it rose to \$1.25 in March, 1938.

The movement of Snyder's index of the general price level since 1875 follows a similar trend to the commodity price index, but, being more comprehensive and hence less sensitive, the fluctuations of Snyder's index are less extreme than those of the wholesale commodity price index.

Consideration of the figures presented indicates that the really violent changes in monetary purchasing power have resulted from war inflations and their subsequent reactions. With few exceptions, the fluctuations of the price level during long periods of peace have been moderate.

[C. F. Warren and F. A. Pearson, *Gold and Prices*;

C. Snyder, *Business Cycles and Business Measurements; Price Bulletins*, Bureau of Labor Statistics.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Money Power. Since the early days of the country a considerable part of the people of the United States have from time to time suspected the existence of what may be termed a "money power" which might, if not controlled, dominate the financial and industrial interests of the country.

Probably the first indication of such a feeling emerged in the early part of the 19th century when the question of renewing the charter of the First Bank of the United States⁷⁰ became a subject of popular discussion. Stress was laid in some quarters on the fact that two thirds of the bank's stock was owned by foreigners—chiefly English financial interests—and that these interests, through the great power of the bank, went far toward controlling the attitude of the bank toward American business interests. The fact that the charge was quite unwarranted, since foreign shareholders could not vote by proxy, did not prevent it from exerting a considerable public influence.

A similar popular prejudice appeared against the Second Bank of the United States after Andrew Jackson's election in 1828. Jackson attacked the bank in a message to Congress in December, 1829, and again in 1830. He won the election in 1832 against Clay, who defended the bank, and hope of a recharter practically vanished. The real opposition of Jackson and his followers to the bank was based upon a distrust and fear of the great money power of the institution.

After the victory of Jackson over the Second Bank, public apprehension over a "money power" was more or less dormant for more than three decades. From 1873 on, however, the concentration of banking power in New York City gave rise to the idea of a "money trust," especially among the people in the interior of the country. The Hughes Committee, in New York State in 1909, conducted an investigation and a number of its recommendations were followed. The Pujo Committee⁷¹, in 1912-13, also conducted a congressional investigation.

Since the investigations of the Pujo Committee, popular prejudice against the concentration of money power has led to the control of interlocking directorates under the Clayton Act of 1914⁷², the abolition of investment affiliates of commercial banks, under the Banking Act of 1933⁷³, and the prohibition of deposit banking by investment bankers under the same act. Although other very definite abuses were aimed at in the legislation just noted, a desire to prevent too great a concentration of money or financial pow-

er undoubtedly played a part in these enactments as in the earlier laws and investigations already discussed.

Although a germ of truth has formed the basis for these periodic displays of public distrust and apprehension over a concentration of money power, a large element of exaggeration of the danger involved has regularly been present.

[J. T. Holdsworth and D. R. Dewey, *The First and Second Banks of the U. S.*; R. C. H. Catterall, *The Second Bank of the U. S.*; M. G. Myers, *The New York Money Market*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Monhegan Island and Fishing Plantation.

This rocky island, one and five-eighths miles long and five eighths of a mile wide, the westernmost of the outlying islands off Penobscot Bay, is the most prominent landmark on this section of the Maine coast, and as such was the sailing objective of most of the early voyagers to New England. It lies close to what John Smith exuberantly claimed were fishing grounds twice as good as those at Newfoundland, and between it and its close neighbor, small Manana, there is a good harbor. Perhaps frequented by the Basque and Portuguese fishermen of the 16th century, the island itself was described by Weymouth, Champlain and Capt. John Smith who spent some time there fishing in 1614, its present name first appearing in his account. Later he tells us that eighty ships came there to fish between 1614 and 1622. It was from these fishermen that Samoset, who greeted the Pilgrims⁷⁴ at Plymouth in March, 1621, learned to speak English. The owner of one of these fishing ships, Abraham Jennings of Plymouth, England, became a member of the New England Council⁷⁵, Nov. 27, 1622, and in the following year, his agent, Abraham Shurt, took possession. Under Shurt's auspices, Jennings' establishment became the largest fishing and trading post in New England and the frequent resort of ships from Virginia, Plymouth and other settlements. Fishing had so declined by 1626, owing to the dispute in Parliament over fishing rights in New England, that Jennings decided to sell out. His stock of goods was purchased by David Thomson of Piscataqua and William Bradford of Plymouth for over £800. The place itself was sold to Aldworth and Elbridge of Bristol, England, for £50. These merchants established their post at Pemaquid⁷⁶ for which they received a grant from the New England Council, Feb. 29, 1631/2, and Monhegan became merely a resort for fishermen, though during some periods down to the abandonment of the area by the English in 1689, there were some settlers. Until 1665 there was no settled government; from 1665 to 1668, and from 1677 to 1686,

New York governed under the Duke of York's^{re} patent of 1664. United with Massachusetts in 1686, it was included in the Massachusetts charter of 1691. The modern settlement of the island dates from 1790. Since Sept. 4, 1839, the island has had the form of government known in Maine as the "plantation."

[Charles Francis Jenney, *The Fortunate Island of Monhegan*.] ROBERT E. MOODY

Monitor and Merrimack, Battle of the (March 9, 1862), was the first battle between ironclad warships^{re}, although neither vessel was the first ironclad. The Confederacy had been quicker in realizing the value of ironclads and in transforming the sunken *Merrimack* into the formidable *Virginia*, but due to the difficulty of obtaining iron plates, lubricating oil and ammunition, she was not ready for action until about twelve hours before the *Monitor* arrived in Hampton Roads. The latter ship, or floating battery, had been designed by John Ericsson and brought to the attention of Secretary Gideon Welles and President Lincoln by C. S. Bushnell, who was seeking a contract for ironclads under the act of Aug. 3, 1861. Naval officers, doubtful of the navigability of Ericsson's battery, approved its construction as an experiment, "with a guarantee and forfeiture in case of failure." The contract, signed Oct. 4, 1861, fixed the cost at \$275,000. The main structure was partly of iron and partly of wood; the sides were covered with iron five inches thick, tapering to three inches below the water. The *Monitor* was 179 feet long, 41 feet wide and 5 feet deep. The deck, only 18 inches above water, was covered with one-inch armor. The revolving iron turret contained two 11-inch guns. Her speed in smooth water was eight knots. Steering troubles on her first trip (Feb. 27) forced a return to New York, which she left finally on March 6, arriving in Hampton Roads late on March 8 (see *Merrimack Destroys the Cumberland* and *Congress*).

Next morning, the *Virginia* (the former *Merrimack*) accompanied by the *Jamestown* and the *Patrick Henry*, and commanded by Lt. Catesby ap Rogers Jones, first attacked the *Minnesota* and then encountered the *Monitor*. The two ironclads fought almost four hours (about 8:45 A.M. to 12:15 P.M.), usually close together or touching. Most of the *Virginia's* shells went over the *Monitor*, and her attempt at ramming her small antagonist only damaged her own bow. The *Monitor* maneuvered easily, but the guns were difficult to aim. Her shot caused no important damage to the *Virginia*, but killed two and wounded nineteen of the latter's crew. Once the *Monitor* withdrew into the shoals to hoist

more shot into the turret. After a shell exploded in the sight-hole of the pilothouse, blinding her commander, Lt. John L. Worden, she again withdrew. Lt. S. D. Greene assumed command, but found that the *Virginia* had turned back to Norfolk, fearing the ebbing tide.

Both sides claimed victory, but it was really a victory of armor over guns. Assistant Secretary G. V. Fox felt the *Monitor* had shown her superiority, but the President ordered caution. When asked to co-operate with McClellan in the Peninsular Campaign^{re}, Flag-officer L. M. Goldsborough, commanding the North Atlantic Squadron, said his first duty was to watch the *Virginia*. He allowed three army steamers to be captured (April 11), and abandoned the attack on Sewell's Point when the *Virginia* approached (May 8). She could not be enticed into a position to be rammed by the vessels gathered for the purpose. As Federal troops approached Norfolk, she was set afire by her commander, Flag-officer Josiah Tattnall (May 11). By hampering McClellan's campaign, she had helped save Richmond.

[J. P. Baxter, *The Introduction of the Ironclad Warship; Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.] W. C. MALLALIEU

Monitors, or ironclad warships^{re} with hulls nearly awash and equipped with revolving gun turrets, were first built by the Swedish engineer, John Ericsson, for the Federal Government in 1862. He had submitted plans for a similar vessel to the French Emperor, Napoleon III, in 1854, but they had been rejected. In Great Britain an English naval inventor, Capt. C. P. Coles, had patented a similar vessel with a revolving turret in 1859. Ericsson's contract for the original *Monitor* was made Oct. 4, 1861. It was to be completed within 100 days, but it was not ready for sea until March 3, 1862. It was towed to Hampton Roads, where it took part in the historic *Monitor* and *Merrimack* engagement^{re} on March 9, 1862. It finally foundered at sea in a storm off Cape Hatteras, Dec. 31, 1862. After its success at Hampton Roads the Federal Government built a number of monitors all patterned on Ericsson's plans. They were used on April 7, 1863, in Admiral Samuel F. DuPont's attack on Charleston^{re} but their performance was disappointing. However, the success of the original *Monitor* gave a world-wide impetus to the adoption of the revolving armored turret. As a type of warship it was abandoned speedily by naval powers due to its limited radius of action, its slowness of fire, its low speed and its almost total lack of ability to maneuver and to keep the sea.

[C. H. Davis, *Life of Charles Henry Davis*; J. P. Baxter, *The Introduction of the Ironclad Warship*.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Monks' Mound. See Cahokia Mounds.

Monmouth, Battle of (June 28, 1778). The British army, under Sir Henry Clinton, evacuated Philadelphia, June 18, and arrived at Monmouth Court House (Freehold, N. J.) on the 26th, on its march to New York. Washington planned a telling blow against the enemy and assigned Maj. Gen. Charles Lee to command the advanced corps, then near Englishtown, with orders to attack the British rear. About 5 o'clock, June 28, word arrived that Clinton's huge baggage train was moving—the signal for Lee's advance. When Lee, after long delays, reached Monmouth Court House, he attempted to cut off 1500 to 2000 troops of the rear guard, but failed. His entire division of over 4000 men then retreated until halted by Washington, two and one-half miles to the rear. After rebuking Lee, Washington skilfully re-formed his lines to meet the enemy, now heavily reinforced. Then followed one of the fiercest contests of the war. Repeated assaults of crack troops of the British army under Gen. Cornwallis failed to break the American lines. Fought in intense heat and engaging some 10,000 men on each side, the battle ended only with darkness. During the night Clinton's army quietly withdrew. Washington reported his loss at 69 killed, 161 wounded; the Americans buried on the field 249 British. A court-martial sustained charges against Lee of disobeying orders and making an unnecessary retreat.

[W. S. Stryker, *The Battle of Monmouth*; S. G. Fisher, *The Struggle for American Independence*.]

C. A. TITUS

Monmouth Purchase, THE, included the region extending "west from Sandy Point [Sandy Hook] along the coast and up the Raritan River and south for twelve miles from any part of this northern line." The original settlers were Quakers and Baptists from Long Island and Newport, R. I., who established Middletown and Shrewsbury on the model of New England towns. Relying upon their patent from Gov. Nicolls (April 8, 1665) they opposed proprietary government and quitrents^o, and passed laws, administered justice and held their own general assemblies. The Duke of York annulled their patent (Nov. 25, 1672) as in conflict with his prior grant of the territory to Berkeley and Carteret.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*.]

C. A. TITUS

Monocacy, Battle of the (July 9, 1864). Gen. Early's Confederate army of approximately 11,000, advancing on Washington, had marched some fourteen miles on July 9, when about 6000

Union troops under Gen. Wallace were found strongly posted on the east bank of the Monocacy, southeast of Frederick, Md. The Confederate right wing crossed the river and broke the Union left which enabled the Confederate center and left to cross. The Union force was routed, and reported 98 killed, 594 wounded and 1188 missing. The Confederates captured nearly 700 prisoners and lost between 600 and 700 killed and wounded. At dawn, July 10, Early resumed the march on Washington.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.]

GEORGE FREDERICK ASHWORTH

Monongahela, Battle of the (July 9, 1755). When the vanguard of Braddock's expedition^o at the site of Braddock, Pa., encountered French and Indians marching from Fort Duquesne^o in a desperate effort to check the English, both sides were taken by surprise. The British guns opened fire immediately, scattering the enemy. After some wavering, however, the Indians occupied a commanding hill and worked through a gully on the other British flank. Caught between two fires, the vanguard retreated, abandoning its guns. The main body, instead of standing to receive the retreating men, rushed forward hastily and in disorder. The advance of the main body forced the flankers in to avoid being cut off, and the whole army became an unmanageable huddle.

The legend of the cowardice of the troops seems to have less foundation than the charge of incompetence among the officers. Certainly the soldiers displayed extraordinary fortitude, withstanding a withering fire for over three hours from a foe concealed behind trees. Attempts to form the ranks and one gallant effort to storm the hill were vain. Most of the officers were killed or wounded, but Washington, who was one of Braddock's aides, was almost miraculously unscathed. Finally Braddock, mortally wounded, ordered a retreat. The general was carried from the field by two provincial officers; the soldiers fled in disorder. Only the Indians' desire for plunder prevented a complete massacre.

[Francis Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*; Stanley Pargellis, Braddock's Defeat, in *American Historical Review*, January, 1936.]

OLON J. BUCK

Monongahela River, an important tributary of the upper Ohio, drains the western slopes of the Allegheny Mountains in northern West Virginia, Maryland and southern Pennsylvania. Its existence was known through Indians and fur traders long before it became historically significant. Possibly utilized by Viele in 1694, a French expedition in 1739 and the Eckerlein brothers

about 1745, its great importance dates from the Ohio Company of 1748th and the Céloronth expedition of 1749. For the former, Christopher Gistth explored the region in 1750 and 1752, and Nemacolin blazed a path from the Potomac to the Monongahela. Washington (*see* Great Meadows), 1753 and 1754, and Braddockth, 1755, used this path. After 1759 Virginia and Maryland frontiersmen pushed west to the Monongahela, which even Pennsylvania pioneers reached by connecting roads. The Monongahela Valley was the first trans-Appalachian English-speaking frontier. Through it and down the river traveled much of later westward migration.

[Alfred P. James, *The First English-Speaking Trans-Appalachian Frontier, Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XVII; James M. Veech, *The Monongahela of Old*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Monopolies. *See* Trusts.

Monopoly in the original sense meant exclusive sale. The fact that the word comes down from the Greek indicates that the practice of monopoly is ancient. In England, as early as 1552, there was a statute against forestalling (buying merchandise before it reached the market), regrating (purchase in a given market for resale in the same market), and ingrossing (buying grain in the fields for the purpose of selling again). The well-known Statute of Monopolies was enacted in 1623. This was directed chiefly against sovereigns who in many instances abused their privileges. Sometimes common articles of consumption were brought under monopoly control. Many of the trading companiesth (chartered) existed under monopoly grant.

The idea of exclusive sale is not a part of the modern concept of monopoly. The term usually means such a control over the supply of commodities or services as to enable persons, or organizations, to keep prices above competitive levels. Such control is said to be inherent in very large organizations (capitalistic monopolies), or in those which enjoy patent rights, or again in those which have ownership in limited natural resources. Franchise monopolies include notably the public utilitiesth.

In the United States the modern era of monopolies is said to begin with the formation of the first Standard Oil Trust in 1879. But, in fact, such control has existed throughout our history. Monopoly control is not alone a feature of big businessth. In earlier days salt, which was relatively more important then than now, was the object of monopoly control. As early as 1830 combinations existed among salt producers along the Kanawha River. In the decade from 1860 to 1870

manufacturers in Michigan formed a control organization which for some years exercised a strong influence over the marketing of salt in the upper Mississippi Valley (The Michigan Salt Association). At an earlier date combinations existed also among steamboat owners on the Ohio River, among transport companies, in some of the manufactures of iron and in cotton textiles. These organizations used most of the devices current today—price-fixingth, limitation of production, allotment of quotas, fixing of resale prices, control over sources of raw materialsth.

In the modern phase, notably since 1880, attempts at monopoly have taken various forms. Among these are pooling—which is a loose combination among producers to control some marketing factor; gentlemen's agreements—also a loose combination; holding companiesth in which the control is brought under the single direction of the holding corporation; interlocking directorsth—a device by which one or more directors serve on the boards of competing companies; leasing of patents under agreement to conform to certain market practices. A few organizations today secure control through ownership of limited natural resources; and, of course, patent grants, at least in the early stages of the development of an invention, give owners a monopoly position; finally, franchise monopolies—grants by the state where competition seems to be undesirable, but where the state regulates the monopoly under a commission or some other administrative body. In the modern phase monopoly is rarely exclusive. The so-called monopolist is usually subjected to more or less severe competition even in the case of patents, as with automobiles, typewriters, electric refrigerators.

[William S. Stevens, *Industrial Combinations and Trusts*.]

ISAAC LIPPINCOTT

Monroe, Fortress, one of the principal fortifications on the Atlantic coast, was foreshadowed in the early settlement of Virginia by Fort Algernourne (1609) and Forts Henry and Charles (1610). In the 18th century Fort George was built near the site of the present fort but was destroyed by a hurricane in 1749. The strategic position of Point Comfort, commanding the entrance to Chesapeake Bay, engaged the attention of the Federal Government, which began the construction of Fortress Monroe in 1819 and Fort Calhoun near by. Fortress Monroe was not completed until 1834. The Confederates made no attempt to capture it, and it continued in Union hands. The first engagement in Virginia, Big Bethel, was fought near by (June 10, 1861). The action of the *Monitor* and *Merrimack*th, March 9,

1862, took place just off the fort. McClellan began the Peninsular Campaign⁹⁷ from it, 1862. Jefferson Davis was confined in it, 1865 to 1867.

[Robert Arthur, *History of Fort Monroe; Battles and Leaders of the Civil War.*]

H. J. ECKENRODE

Monroe Doctrine, THE (Dec. 2, 1823). From the very beginning of our Federal history there has been a strong tendency to differentiate America from Europe, and to assume that as little political connection should exist between the two as is possible. Expressions of this viewpoint can be found in Washington's Farewell Address⁹⁸ and in Jefferson's First Inaugural. Monroe's message of Dec. 2, 1823, supplemented this previous formula by seeking to exclude European intervention from the New World. The message was due to two different sets of circumstances. The pretensions of the Russian government to exclude all but Russian vessels from the Northwest coast of America north of fifty-one degrees precipitated a diplomatic controversy in the course of which Monroe's Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, laid down the principle that European governments could establish no new colonies in the New World, every portion thereof having been already occupied. Monroe, in the message of 1823, repeated Adams' formula virtually in Adams' own words, declaring that "the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." A second reason for the message lay in the fear that the continental European powers were planning the reconquest of the Spanish American republics which had declared their independence of Spain (*see Latin-American Republics, Recognition of*). Suggestions of such a purpose came to Monroe and his cabinet from Richard Rush, the United States minister in London, who got them from George Canning, the British Foreign Secretary, and more directly from the language of the Tsar Alexander in a memorandum addressed to the American Government in October, 1823. After long cabinet discussions, the President fixed upon a pronouncement which warned against intervention⁹⁹, and, with regard to the Spanish colonies, declared that "we could not view any interposition with the view of oppressing them or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

While the message was enthusiastically received in the United States, it had little practical influence at the time. The European powers never in-

tended intervention on any considerable scale and viewed the message with irritation and contempt.

The United States itself, on four separate occasions in the years immediately following 1823, refused to make any commitments looking to the carrying out of the policy outlined by Monroe, and the debates on the Panama Congress¹⁰⁰ in 1826 showed that, beyond the shadow of a doubt, American opinion was hostile to any alliance with the new states. They themselves, as a matter of fact, became economically and financially, if not politically, more dependent on Great Britain than on the Republic to the north.

For some time after 1826 Monroe's message remained virtually unnoticed, and minor violations of it occurred in the encroachments of Britain in Central America and in the acquisition by Great Britain of the Falkland Islands¹⁰¹.

The first great revival of interest in it came in 1845 and was produced by the intrigues of Great Britain and France to prevent the annexation of Texas¹⁰² to the United States, by the difference of opinion over Oregon, and fear of British purposes in California (*see Oregon Question*). On Dec. 2, 1845, President Polk reiterated the principles of President Monroe, condemning not only intervention, but the application of the principle of the balance of power to the New World (*see Polk Doctrine*). He emphasized particularly the significance of this principle with regard to North America. Again, as in 1823, the immediate results were not important, but the principle had begun to sink into the American mind, and Polk gave it new expression.

On April 29, 1848, in a message in which he declared that an English or Spanish protectorate over Yucatan would be a violation of the principles of 1823, Polk declared that the threat of such action might compel the United States itself to assume control over the region in question. In this message, for the first time, the Monroe principle was made the basis for measures of expansion (*see "Manifest Destiny"*). No action was taken, however.

In the 1850's, the message figured again and again in connection with the dispute over the Central American question and attained increasing popularity (*see Clayton-Bulwer Treaty*). From a partisan or Democratic dogma, it began to rise to the rank of a national principle. It was cited in international correspondence and its significance was recognized (though its validity was denied) by more than one European statesman.

The Civil War offered to the powers of Europe an excellent opportunity to challenge Monroe's principles. Taking advantage of the situation,

Spain intervened in Santo Domingo and France sought to establish in Mexico an Empire under the rule of the Austrian Archduke, Maximilian (*see* Mexico, French in). When, at the outbreak of the war, Seward, Secretary of State, attempted to invoke the Monroe Doctrine against the first of these powers, he received a sharp rebuff, but learning from experience, he waited before challenging the French in Mexico until the success of American arms made it possible for him to assert the Doctrine with increasing vigor. While other circumstances contributed to the collapse of Maximilian's Empire, there can be no question that the diplomatic pressure exerted by the American Government in 1865 was keenly felt in Paris, and that fear of the United States was a factor in the French decision to withdraw its troops from Mexico. The Doctrine, in the meantime, had attained an immense popularity at home.

The events of the 1870's and the 1880's are less dramatic, but a steady tendency developed to expand the scope of the Doctrine. The principle that no territory might be transferred in the New World from one European power to another, not altogether unknown in the previous epoch, became more and more closely linked with Monroe's principles, especially through the efforts of President Grant and his Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish. The Doctrine was cited even less in consonance with its original terms, or with Polk's interpretation of it, as forbidding the construction by Europeans of a transisthmian canal (*see* Panama Canal), and still more as implying that such a canal must be under the exclusive guarantee of the United States. This point of view, the cause of acute diplomatic controversy in the 1880's, was accepted by Great Britain toward the end of the century in the famous Hay-Pauncefote Treaty⁹⁰.

One of the most dramatic extensions of the Doctrine was Grover Cleveland's assertion that its principles compelled Great Britain to arbitrate a boundary dispute with the Republic of Venezuela⁹¹ over the limitations of British Guiana. President Cleveland's position produced a serious diplomatic crisis, but the moderation displayed by the British government permitted a peaceful solution of the difficulty (*see* Olney Corollary of Monroe Doctrine).

The growing nationalism of the United States toward the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century was not without its effect upon the Doctrine. The joint intervention of Great Britain, Germany and Italy against Venezuela, looking to the satisfaction of pecuniary claims, we now know quite definitely, concealed no ul-

terior purpose, but it produced widespread irritation in the United States. The story of German designs of conquest is pure legend, but that the Theodore Roosevelt administration, which began with an attitude of great moderation, was gradually rendered more and more nervous by the intervention, and was considering diplomatic measures to bring it to an end, is certainly true (*see* Venezuela, Blockade of). On President Roosevelt himself the effect of the intervention was important. He moved toward the position that the United States must assume a measure of control of the more unruly of the Latin-American states in order to prevent European action against them, and in 1905 a treaty for American control of customs in Santo Domingo was negotiated (*see* Dominican Republic, Relations with). While it met with opposition in the Senate, it was ratified in 1907. In the meantime the President, in his message of 1904, had definitely laid down the doctrine that chronic wrongdoing by a Latin-American state might compel American action. The precedent which he established has more than once been applied, or attempted to be applied, especially in the Caribbean area, and, in general, in the not infrequent interventions in the affairs of Caribbean states the Doctrine has figured as justification (*see* Caribbean Policy).

Of recent years, however, there has been a change. Increasing resentment against American interference in the affairs of the Republics of Latin America has been reflected in actual policy (*see* Latin-American Relations). The interventions of the United States in Haiti and Santo Domingo in 1915 and 1916, during the administration of President Wilson, were liquidated, respectively, in 1934 and 1924. The intervention in Nicaragua in the Coolidge administration was short-lived. Under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, pledges against armed intervention were given, and at the Seventh Pan-American Conference⁹² at Montevideo a definite treaty was signed, pledging the signatories not to intervene in the internal and external affairs of one another. At Buenos Aires in 1936 the practice of collecting pecuniary obligations by armed force was declared illegal (*see* Peace Conference at Buenos Aires).

The Monroe Doctrine has never obtained a true international status. At the World War Peace Conference⁹³ in 1919, in order to placate domestic opposition to the covenant of the League⁹⁴, President Wilson was obliged to incorporate in that document an article declaring that nothing therein contained should affect the legal validity of a regional understanding such as the Monroe Doctrine. The exact interpretation of

such a phrase, however, must remain doubtful, and it is difficult to maintain that it implies complete European recognition of the American dogma. It was certainly far from acceptable to the more nationalistic supporters of Monroe's principles in the United States.

In America, as the evolution of the American attitude toward intervention shows, there has been somewhat of a reaction against extreme interpretations of the principles of 1823. Secretary Hughes attempted to dissociate our various interventions in the Caribbean area from the Monroe Doctrine. In 1929 the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate of the United States, in transmitting the Briand-Kellogg Pact⁷, added a gloss or separate report in which the Monroe Doctrine was conservatively interpreted and based upon the principle of self-defense. The Roosevelt Corollary⁸ of 1904 was definitely excluded.

On the other hand, there is no question that the words "Monroe Doctrine" are still words to conjure with in the United States, and that there is a very great sensitiveness with regard to all European activities in this hemisphere. Emotionally the phrase has an immense appeal which operates to fortify a purely isolationist policy on the part of our own Government. Abroad, the intensity of this feeling is well understood. It is extremely doubtful whether any nation would challenge it directly, nor indeed has it been so challenged for more than seventy years.

The Monroe Doctrine is not international law⁹. Its principles may be deduced from other principles truly legal, such as the right of self-defense and self-preservation, but fundamentally the Doctrine is an article of faith, all the more powerful because it has its roots in emotion rather than in reason.

[United States Library of Congress, *List of References on the Monroe Doctrine*; Phillips Bradley, *A Bibliography of the Monroe Doctrine, 1919-1929*, London School of Economics and Political Science, Series of Bibliographies, No. 7; J. B. Moore, *A Digest of International Law*; Worthington C. Ford, *Genesis of the Monroe Doctrine*, in Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, 2nd ser., Vol. XV; Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1826*, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1826-1867*, and *The Monroe Doctrine, 1867-1907*; David Y. Thomas, *One Hundred Years of the Monroe Doctrine, 1823-1923*; Charles Evans Hughes, *The Pathway of Peace*; J. Reuben Clark, *Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine*, United States, Department of State, Publication No. 37; A. Alvarez, *The Monroe Doctrine*; C. H. Haring, *South America Looks at the United States*; C. C. Hyde, *International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States*; J. W. Garner, *American Foreign Policies, an Examination and Evaluation of Certain Traditional and Recent International Policies of the United States*.] DEXTER PERKINS

Monroe Mission to France (1794-96). The rapid development of the French Revolution made Gouverneur Morris unpopular as the American minister to France. His sympathies were strongly monarchial. The French government suggested his recall when Citizen Genêt¹⁰ was recalled from the United States. James Monroe was selected to replace Morris because of his known friendship for the French Republic. He arrived in Paris in August, 1794, and found the French Revolution rapidly changing. He took a fraternal tone toward the revolutionary government and immediately became popular. Monroe, however, faced a double difficulty which eventually deprived him of the confidence both of the French government and of President Washington. Jay's Treaty¹¹ was negotiated with England in 1794. Monroe, having been kept in ignorance of the real character of Jay's mission, was instructed to allay French suspicions. He informed the French government that Jay had been positively forbidden to weaken the engagements between the United States and France. Monroe was in no position to defend the Jay Treaty when its text was revealed, containing provisions harmful to our ally France. Monroe tried to palliate what seemed to him to be the ill faith of Washington's Cabinet. The Federalist¹² leaders were able to convince Washington that Monroe's conduct was disloyal to the administration and the President recalled him. Washington's decision was approved by many Americans whose sympathies had been alienated by the bloody excesses of the French Revolution. The French government refused to receive Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, appointed as Monroe's successor, and this led to the "X. Y. Z." affair¹³.

[Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*.]
CHARLES MARION THOMAS

Monroe-Pinkney Treaty, THE. On Dec. 31, 1806, James Monroe and William Pinkney signed an agreement replacing the Jay Treaty¹⁴ just expiring. Notwithstanding some concessions from Great Britain, impressments¹⁵ and indemnities for previous ship and cargo seizures remained an issue. Jefferson refused to submit the treaty to the Senate, but sought to utilize it as a base for further negotiation. In this he was rebuffed by Canning, British Foreign Secretary. Monroe was naturally displeased at this treatment of his labors, and there ensued a temporary rift within the Democratic party.

[Charles E. Hill, James Madison, in *The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, edited by Samuel Flagg Bemis, Vol. III.]

LOUIS MARTIN SEARS

Montana. The eastern part of Montana became an American possession in 1803 by the Louisiana Purchase^m; the western portion was a part of the Oregon Country, conceded by Great Britain to be American territory by the Oregon Treaty of 1846^m. The primary exploration of both sections was by Lewis and Clark^m in 1805-6; a trip up the Missouri by Prince Maximilian of Wied in 1833 added to the ethnology and geography of the region; and the survey by Maj. I. I. Stevens^m (1853) of a railroad route from St. Paul to Puget Sound brought additional information. At this time the Blackfoot^m confederacy occupied the area north of the Missouri, the Crows^m held the region south of the Yellowstone, Siouan tribes (see Sioux Indians) contested the terrain near the confluence of these rivers, and the central rolling plains were neutral hunting grounds shared with the Shoshone by all of these peoples. The Flatheads^m occupied the Bitter Root Valley, and among them Father Jean Pierre de Smet (1842) founded his mission (see Owen, Fort).

Manuel Lisa^m opened the fur trade on the upper Missouri in 1809, and since that time the area has continually furnished a supply of beaver, muskrat and other pelts. Some of the traders settled to agricultural life in the beautiful valleys. After migration to Oregon began, their numbers were augmented by some who had aimed for the Willamette^m but had compromised with the hardships of the trek by going no farther than the Bitter Root, the Yellowstone or the Missouri headwaters. Thus was created that small settlement in Bitter Root Valley which requested Washington Territory to erect for them a county government. In response, the region east of the 117th meridian and west of the Rockies was designated in 1860-61 as Missoula and Shoshone counties. (See also Idaho.)

Gold had already been discovered in the region. Capt. John Mullan's report on a feasible wagon route from Fort Benton^m, head of navigation on the Missouri, to Fort Walla Walla^m in the Columbia Valley, described a route to gold deposits at a time (1863) when many men were anxious to get away from war. This information swelled the number of gold seekers. Gold was found at Bannack in 1862, at Virginia City^m in 1863, and at Helena^m in 1864. Each locality had its own provisional government, and the law of the mining camps prevailed. Increase of population, however, had made necessary a civil government, and in 1864 the Territory of Montana was created.

Placer mining^m gave way to quartz mining. At Butte, the Asteroid produced Montana's first silver in June, 1866, but it was not until January,

1895, that the mine was really worked. Silver, then copper, replaced gold as the most valuable mineral product. The allocation of the aborigines and the coming of railroads—the Northern Pacific in 1885, Great Northern in 1887, C. B. & Q. in 1894, C. M. & St. P.^m in 1908—enabled wheatgrowers, cattle and sheep men to market their products. Since 1900 a diversification of additional products, such as mutton, wool, sugar beets and petroleum, has yielded wealth.

Statehood was gained in 1889, the first governor being Joseph Kemp Toole. Between 1890 and 1910 copper mining was the principal industry of the state. Strife over taxation between mine operators and ranchmen characterized the legislative sessions, each group feeling that it was bearing an unfair share of the rapidly mounting cost of public administration and services. A purely personal feud between two copper magnates, Daly and Clark, resulted in bitter public controversies. Among these were: (1) the choice of location for the state capitol; (2) the senatorial aspirations of Clark.

Montana has, politically speaking, been a "doubtful" state, voting in every presidential election since 1900 with the majority. Party affiliation is kept secret even in the primaries. Initiative and referendum^m are provided by the constitution, and political thought is generally progressive.

[R. G. Thwaites, ed., *Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1804-1806*; F. L. Paxson, *History of the American Frontier*; Robert G. Raymer, *Montana: The Land and the People*.]

ROBERT G. RAYMER

Montdidier-Noyon Operation (June 9-13, 1918). Stopped in the Marne area by June 4, the Germans launched a new attack, on a twenty-mile front, June 9, west of Soissons, between Montdidier and Noyon. The resistance of the French Third Army, weak at first, stiffened as the Germans penetrated. On June 10, the attack having slowed, Gen. Fayolle entrusted a counterattack to Gen. Mangin. Working feverishly, Mangin collected his forces, established his supply, and, on June 11, launched a counterattack which drove the victorious Germans back for three miles. The American 1st Division at Cantigny came under artillery preparation fire and sustained raids directed against it during this operation.

[John J. Pershing, *My Experiences in the World War*; *The Aisne and Montdidier-Noyon Operations*, Monograph No. 13, Historical Section, Army War College, Washington, D. C.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Monterey, Battles of (Sept. 21-23, 1846). In the Mexican War^m, Gen. Zachary Taylor's invad-

ing army of 6000 attacked Monterey (in north-eastern Mexico and not to be confused with Monterey in California), which was defended by Gen. Ampudia with 9000 men. The first day's fight outside the city paved the way for the assault upon three fortified hills which guarded the approach, and which were carried before daybreak on the 22nd. On that day and the next the Americans completed the conquest of the city. An eight-weeks' armistice was agreed upon, but repudiated by Congress, and the fighting was renewed within six weeks.

[W. E. Connelley, *History of the Mexican War, 1846-48.*]
ALVIN F. HARLOW

Monterey, Calif., was founded by Gaspar de Portolá in 1770, and served as the capital of Spanish and Mexican California^{qv} from 1777 to 1845. Although in the latter year Los Angeles became the seat of civil government, Monterey remained the fiscal and military headquarters, as well as the center of social life. The town was under the United States flag for one day, Oct. 19, 1842, when Commodore Thomas ap Jones seized it in the belief that war existed between Mexico and the United States. Permanent American control came during the Mexican War^{qv}, with Monterey's surrender, without resistance, to Commodore John D. Sloat on July 7, 1846.

[C. E. Chapman, *A History of California: The Spanish Period*; L. B. Powers, *Old Monterey: California's Adobe Capital.*]

CHARLES EDWARD CHAPMAN
ROBERT HALE SHIELDS

Montgomery, Fort. See Highlands, The.

Montgomery Convention, THE, assembled at Montgomery, Ala., Feb. 4, 1861, to organize the Confederate States of America^{qv}. Representatives were present from six states of the lower South (South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida and Louisiana).

The convention drafted a provisional constitution for the Confederate states. It then declared itself a provisional legislature and set up a government without waiting for the ratification of the constitution.

The next important step in setting up this government was the selection of the President and Vice-President. For President, the convention selected Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, a conservative who had not actively supported secession^{qv}. For Vice-President, Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, who had actively opposed secession, was chosen.

The convention continued to sit in Montgomery until May 20, 1861, when it adjourned

to meet in Richmond on July 20. It added new members as other states seceded and acted interchangeably as a constitutional convention and a provisional legislature. It completed a permanent constitution (adopted March 11, 1861), and supervised its ratification. It directed the election in November, 1861, at which a Congress and a President and Vice-President were elected; it also passed all laws which were necessary to adapt the existing laws and machinery of the Government of the United States to the needs of the new government. With the inauguration of the permanent government (Feb. 22, 1862) it adjourned.

[J. G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction.*]

HALLIE FARMER

Monticello was the home of Thomas Jefferson, on a "little mountain," near Charlottesville, Va. The spot came into Jefferson's possession by inheritance from his father. Excavation and the preparation of lumber were started in 1767-68. In the following summer the summit was leveled and brick making begun. A small brick house, still standing, was constructed, into which Jefferson moved in 1770. For a decade the big house was under construction. Jefferson, as his own architect, built, in Italian style, on the model of Palladio. But Monticello, today, is not this original structure. After five years in Europe and examination of many buildings, Jefferson greatly altered Monticello. The result was an Italian villa, with a Greek portico, a Roman dome and many colonial features. The home of Jefferson for fifty-six years, Monticello was the mecca of tourists and visitors, the entertainment of whom impoverished Jefferson. On his death the estate passed from his heirs to Uriah Levy, who willed it to the people of the United States, but the will was overthrown. Eventually the estate has come under the control of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation.

[Paul Wilstack, Jefferson's Little Mountain, in *National Geographic Magazine*, April, 1929.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Montreal, Capture of (1760). Wolfe's victory at Quebec in 1759 was followed on Sept. 8 of the following year by the surrender of Montreal. The spirits of the French had been raised by the success of the Chevalier de Lévis at Ste. Foy on April 28, but not for long. Everything depended upon whether the French or the English fleet would first come to the rescue. On May 15 the vanguard of the English ships appeared below Quebec. Lévis, abandoning hope of help from France, raised the siege and retreated up the river. The English, knowing that Montreal was

doomed, prepared at their leisure for the final stroke. The plan of campaign had been carefully prepared. While Gen. Geoffrey Amherst moved north from New York to Lake Ontario and descended the St. Lawrence, Gen. James Murray with another army and the fleet moved up the river, and Col. Haviland approached by way of Lake Champlain. On Sept. 8, 1760, the governor, the Marquis de Vaudreuil, at Amherst's demand, surrendered Montreal, and with it Canada (*see* Paris, Treaty of, 1763).

[George M. Wrong, *The Fall of Canada, 1759-1760*; William Wood, *The Fight for Canada*.]

LAWRENCE J. BURPEE

Montreal, Capture of (1775). After the fall of St. Johns^{re}, Nov. 2, 1775, the main body of the American force under Gen. Montgomery pushed on toward Montreal, which Ethan Allen had failed to take by a *coup de main* in September. Gov. Carleton was in the city, but, as the fortifications were weak and ruinous, he made no attempt to defend it, and on Nov. 11 slipped away with the garrison down the river toward Quebec. American batteries at Sorel barred the way, and the flotilla and the troops were captured; but Carleton himself reached Quebec in safety. On Nov. 13 the American troops marched into Montreal without encountering resistance. The city remained in American hands until June 15, 1776.

[A. L. Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec*; Justin H. Smith, *Our Struggle for the Fourteenth Colony*.]

C. P. STACEY

Montreal, The Wilkinson Expedition against. In 1813 Gen. James Wilkinson assumed command of the Northern troops distributed from Champlain to Niagara, with headquarters at Sackett's Harbor^{re}. Wilkinson arrived at Sackett's Harbor in late August, and spent two months assembling forces. According to War Department plans his objective should have been the British base, Kingston, directly opposite. Wilkinson chose to advance on Montreal. It was Nov. 1 before the expedition—about 7000 men in 300 boats—started down the St. Lawrence, constantly harried by British gunboats and batteries on shore. On Nov. 10 the flotilla reached the Long Sault Rapids, still 100 miles from Montreal. Troops were landed to protect their subsequent progress, but re-embarked after hard fighting at Chrysler's Field^{re}. Further disheartened by wintry weather, sickness and non-arrival of troops from Lake Champlain, Wilkinson now retreated up the Salmon River to winter quarters at French Mills. In February, 1814, his army was further withdrawn to Plattsburg (*see* Lacolle

Mill, The Battle of) and Sackett's Harbor, ending this badly mismanaged campaign.

[J. R. Jacobs, *Famished Warrior*.]

ALLAN F. WESTCOTT

Monuments, National. The national parks^{re} and national monuments are so closely allied that a sharp line of demarcation cannot be drawn between them. In general, national parks are areas preserved in Federal ownership by act of Congress because of superlative scenery or natural wonders which are distinctly national in importance and interest; national monuments are reserved by presidential proclamation because of their historic, archæologic or scientific values. Some of the present national parks were once national monuments. At the present time (1939) there are eighty national monuments with seven more in "project" status. The majority of the national monuments were created by presidential proclamation under authority of "An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities," June 8, 1906. They may be divided into four general classes: six are of biological significance, fifteen of archæological nature, twenty-eight of historical values and thirty-three with peculiar geological manifestations. Examples of the first group, biological areas, are found in Muir Woods, established in 1908, north of San Francisco, Calif., notable for its great grove of redwood trees; in Organ Pipe Cactus, Ariz., established in 1937 to preserve the unusually fine examples of the rapidly disappearing Organ Pipe Cactus; in Joshua Tree, Calif., 1936, where spectacular desert floral features abound; and in Palm Canyon, Calif. (project), where the notable native *Washingtonia Palm* occurs. The archæological monuments are especially well known by such examples as Aztec Ruins, N. Mex., 1923, dating from 1100 A.D. and featuring a pueblo^{re} of 500 rooms; Casa Grande, Ariz., 1892 and 1918, famous for its "Great House," once four stories in height, with walls of solid adobe four feet thick at the base; Montezuma Castle, Ariz., 1906, a true cliff dwelling^{re} of spectacular appearance situated in a cavity in the face of a vertical cliff, eighty feet above the ground; Chaco Canyon, N. Mex., 1907, offering in its seventeen major ruins unequaled evidences of primitive architectural skill; Wupatki, Ariz., 1924, with its prehistoric (11th or 12th century) dwellings of the ancestors of the Hopi Indians^{re}; and Ocmulgee, Ga., 1936, containing the most important Indian mounds so far excavated in the Southeast. The historic monuments may be exemplified by Big Hole Battlefield, Mont., 1910, where in 1877 a small force of U. S. troops routed the Nez Percé In-

dians[™]; Fort Jefferson, Fla., 1935, featuring the largest masonry fortification in the Western World built in 1846 for the control of Florida Straits; Fort Marion[™], Fla., 1924, the Spanish fort, Castle San Marcos, the oldest fort in the United States, George Washington Birthplace, Va., memorializing the boyhood of the first President, Perry's Victory Memorial, Ohio, 1936, commemorating the victory of Commodore Perry over the British fleet at Put-In Bay[™]; Scotts Bluff, Nebr., 1919, a famous landmark on the Oregon Trail[™], at which place the story of Western expansion is interpreted; Statue of Liberty[™], New York, 1924, commemorating the French alliance with the Americans during the Revolutionary War; and Tumacacori, Ariz., 1908, where is featured the ruin of a Spanish mission established by the Jesuit padre, Kino, in the 17th century and later developed by the Franciscans during the 18th century. The more numerous areas in which geological phenomena find leading place are exemplified by Natural Bridges, Utah, 1908, where stream erosion has produced three rock bridges of great size and beauty in the White Canyon; Petrified Forest, Ariz., 1906, noted for its fossil forests of Triassic Age which exist as agate, onyx, carnelian and jasper relics of great trees that flourished 200,000,000 years ago; White Sands, N. Mex., 1933, an area of windblown gypsum; and Badlands[™], S. Dak., exhibiting fantastic ridges weathered to produce spectacular ravines and cliffs of variegated colors. Death Valley[™], Calif., is the largest of the monuments, containing nearly 2,000,000 acres; Cabrillo, also in California, is the smallest, having but a half acre of land within its boundaries. All are under the administration of the National Park Service.

[National Park Service, *Glimpses of Our National Monuments*; *Southwestern National Monuments*, containing Maps and Descriptive Matter on Twenty-Six National Monuments.]

CARL P. RUSSELL

Moody and Sankey, Revivals of. See Revivals.

Moon Hoax, THE (Aug. 25-31, 1835). On Aug. 25, 1835, the New York *Sun* first announced wonderful discoveries on the moon by Sir John Herschel through an improved telescope at the Cape of Good Hope. Batlike beings, temples of polished sapphire and a beautiful inland sea were shown by word description and illustrations. The hoax, really written by Richard A. Locke, an Englishman reporting for the *Sun*, fooled most New Yorkers, even some Yale professors. It was finally explained as a satire, but it put the *Sun* on the road to prosperity and led to later

hoaxes, such as Poe's *Balloon Hoax*, also published in the *Sun*.

[E. A. Poe, *The Laterati*; F. M. O'Brien, *The Story of the Sun*.]
WALTER B. NORRIS

Mooney Case. During a strike in 1913 Thomas J. Mooney, a minor labor leader, and his wife, together with Warren K. Billings and two others, all connected with labor organizations, had been arrested and tried on the charge of unlawful possession of explosives. Mooney was acquitted; Billings served two years in prison.

On July 22, 1916, a Preparedness[™] Day parade was in progress in San Francisco when a bomb exploded on the sidewalk, killing outright or mortally injuring ten persons and wounding forty others. Mooney and Billings were among those charged with the outrage, Mooney was sentenced to death and Billings received a life sentence. The case against Mooney was weak, and some of the evidence so questionable that Judge Griffin, who presided at his trial, finally became convinced that the trial had been unfair, and joined in the long fight to save Mooney. In 1918 President Wilson asked Gov. Stephens of California to delay the execution, with the result that Stephens eventually commuted Mooney's sentence to life imprisonment. Labor and other organizations fought steadily in his behalf. Governor after governor was petitioned for pardon or a rehearing. On Jan. 7, 1939, Gov. Culbert L. Olson, only a few days after his inauguration, pardoned Mooney, and, on Oct. 16 following, released Billings through a commutation of his sentence.

[E. J. Hopkins, *What Happened in the Mooney Case*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

"Moonshine" was an old cant term in southern England for smuggled liquor, indicating that it was customarily transported by night. The name "moonshiner" for an illicit distiller in our southern Appalachian area came into popular use in the 19th century, some of that functionary's work and many of his deliveries being accomplished at night. His still was apt to be in a wild place among thickets or rocks, in a gorge or a cave. His product was locally known as "brush whiskey" or "blockade," the term "moonshine" not being used of the liquor itself. The blockader, as he most often called himself, made illicit whiskey because he believed that a man had as much right to do so as to make his own molasses, and because this was the only way in which a fair monetary return could be obtained for the mountain corn crop (see Whiskey Insurrection). After 1877, when the Government intensified its campaign against moonshining, armed revenue of-

ficers were constantly active in the southern mountains, killings were frequent, and sometimes pitched battles were fought, but the business was never quite eliminated. During the Prohibition^{er} era, the word "moonshine" came to be popularly applied to liquor illicitly made anywhere, even in the home.

[Horace Kephart, *Our Southern Highlanders*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Moore's Creek Bridge, Battle at (Feb. 27, 1776). A decisive victory of North Carolina Whigs over North Carolina Loyalists. Aptly called "the Lexington and Concord" of the South, this battle, fought eighteen miles above Wilmington, crushed the Loyalists^{er}, aroused the Whigs, stimulated the independence movement and prevented British invasion of the state in 1776. In the battle, which lasted only three minutes, 1600 Loyalists were overwhelmed by 1100 Whigs. The latter had one killed and one wounded; the former fifty killed or wounded and 850 prisoners. The Whigs also captured 350 guns, 150 swords, 1500 rifles, 13 wagons, medical supplies and £15,000 sterling.

[Hugh T. Lefler, *North Carolina History Told by Contemporaries*.]

HUGH T. LEFLER

Moqui Indians. See Hopi Indians.

Moral Societies. The religious upsurge beginning late in the 18th century brought about the appearance of innumerable associations whose general intent was expressed by the names of the Society for the Reformation of Morals, organized in 1813, and the New York Moral Reform Society, chartered in 1834. Many of them had temperance^{er} as one of their cardinal principles. There were dozens of groups printing and distributing moral and religious pamphlets; about fifty of these were absorbed by the American Tract Society^{er}, organized in 1825. Antislavery, antitobacco and peace societies sprang up. The National Lord's Day Society had former President John Quincy Adams presiding at its annual meeting in 1844. The American Female Guardian Society aimed to "throw good influences around poor young women," while the Young Men's Association for Mutual Improvement had a similar intent toward the other sex. The Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A.^{er}, the Societies for Ethical Culture (first one organized in 1876) and others are later manifestations of the same tendencies.

[E. Douglas Branch, *The Sentimental Years*; Gilbert Seldes, *The Stammering Century*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Morals. The history of morality in the United States is one of a changing code rather than a consistent evolution. Surveyed from a long-range viewpoint, there seems to be a trend in American morality away from emphasis upon private to social or group morals. This can easily be exaggerated, and, so far as standards or practices are concerned, progress seems to be opposite to this stress, on account of a decline of integrity in group organizations and even in government activities.

The history of American morals cannot be understood as a separate, self-contained line of behavior. Instead, the changes that occur are mostly reflections of varying environments. The relation of moral practices and the total environment of physical and cultural conditions is not a mere passive response of the moral code, but environmental conditions in the large sense are dominant in the interactions.

The environmental change that has affected most clearly and directly the moral standards and practices has been the growth of cities^{er} giving them an increasing importance and an eventual ascendancy over rural and village sections in prestige, political and commercial power, and in culture in its narrow meaning. The social coercion associated with primary contacts in country and village communities has been lost by this expansion of urban life with its excess of those secondary relationships that can give people only partial knowledge of those with whom they have association. The urban centers also, for the most part, have possession of the means of bringing about that impersonal but influential relationship made possible by radio and by movies which has been designated "tertiary contacts."

The composition of the American population, especially during the period when there was great immigration from eastern and southern Europe, has also influenced American morality. The World War, by its increased cosmopolitanism, especially in the cities, affected recent morals and added to the ethical instability characteristic of a period of rapid social and industrial changes.

Living conditions, especially as they have been modified by inventions such as the automobile, the movies and the radio^{er}, have greatly affected both attitudes and behavior. The practical anonymity, for example, provided by the automobile, has not only encouraged crime but has weakened the conventions that have maintained the sex code. A lessening of the control over conduct by the church and the family^{er} has also contributed to the moral confusion.

From the time of the first settlement to near the close of the 19th century, private morals and

social conventions were characteristically rigid. The strictness with which Sunday was generally observed in the Northern and Eastern states is an example. The toiling masses in the industrial centers, coming from a more liberal European background, were by 1870 making inroads upon the Puritan Sabbath⁹⁹. They were reinforced by the popularity of the Sunday newspaper which started in the effort to meet the need for news of battles during the Civil War.

From the beginning of American history, so much stress was placed upon sex conduct that it was at first almost a synonym for morality. The general influence of New World conditions was relatively favorable to chastity. In spite of this, a double standard of morality, registering masculine dominance, made headway in the East and in the South, stimulated by the urbanism and industrialism of the former and the slave system of the latter. Strict taboo against any open discussion of sex was maintained even into the 20th century, and it is still enforced in some sections. Inconsistent with this was the publication of Havelock Ellis' *Psychology of Sex* by an American firm because of the author's prosecution in England. Prudery was almost universal, yet in the latter part of the 19th century we find newspapers carrying advertisements of sex matters that public opinion now would not tolerate.

With the growth of American cities, especially after the Civil War period, came the graft and machine⁹⁹ corruption that is revealed spasmodically in our own period. The rapid development of the country encouraged speculation, and gambling⁹⁹ in changing forms has been a major vice throughout the history of American morals. Lawlessness⁹⁹ is one form of social immorality that showed itself early and still continues.

The rapid expansion of industry in the United States and the increasing complexity of commercial relationships reshaped the problems of business integrity and brought forth from businessmen themselves various attempts by codes, reports, judicial proceedings and the like, to build and enforce business ethics that would prevent frauds and unfair competition and safeguard the rights of the consumer. Progress has been made in the last two decades, but of late there have been losses, especially in the disregard of contracts. Labor-employer relationships, as a consequence, have been thrown into a confusion that has greatly hampered the recovery of business from the prevailing depression (see National Labor Relations Board). The Federal Government itself has contributed to this feeling of irresponsibility for contracts by its own failure to fulfil its promises (see Gold Clause Cases).

This laxity in meeting contracts is one of the evidences of a changing moral attitude on the part of a large portion of the American people, a retreat from the standards and traditions firmly held a generation ago.

[E. D. Heermance, *Codes of Ethics*; C. T. Taeusch, *Policy and Ethics in Business*; A. M. Schlesinger and Dixon Ryan Fox, eds., *A History of American Life*; Freda Kirchwey, ed., *Our Changing Morality*.]

ERNEST R. GROVES

Moratorium, Hoover. The ominous financial situation throughout the world in the spring of 1931, and its disastrous effects on American conditions, led President Hoover, on June 20, to propose a one-year international postponement "of all payments on intergovernmental debts, reparations, and relief debts, both principal and interest, of course not including obligations of governments held by private parties," in the hope that such action would promote a world-wide restoration of confidence and economic stability. By July 6 the fifteen nations involved had accepted the proposal. It was predicted by many economists and financiers, however, that resumption of payments would encounter insurmountable objections in the debtor countries, and experience has confirmed their views (see War Debts).

[R. L. Wilbur and A. M. Hyde, *The Hoover Policies*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Moratoriums. Major depressions have certain recurring phenomena, breakdown of credit, failure of financial institutions and business houses, loss of confidence, unemployment—a series of vicious repercussions under which conditions tend to go from bad to worse. Commodity prices fall, money is scarce and has greater purchasing power, while the burden of debt is correspondingly heavier. Farmers and home owners with mortgaged property, faced with the loss of their equities, demand relief, which, under the American constitutional system, is largely in the hands of the state legislature. All these factors and forces were at work throughout the nation during 1930-33, conditions in the agricultural states being especially acute.

The moratorium, a legalized postponement of the fulfilment of contracts, was widely authorized. Foreclosure of mortgages because of its social implications was dealt with by many states, the acts of Michigan, New York and Minnesota being typical. Such a remedy requires skilful formulation and administration because of its possible adverse effects on the resources of banks, insurance companies and other lenders. The difficulty of the problem is well explained in Gov.

Lehman's special message recommending such legislation to the New York assembly, Aug. 2, 1933. Gov Martin of Washington wrote an equally instructive message, March 20, vetoing an enactment of the legislature on the ground that the sweeping moratorium provided would have ruinous results in delaying all debt payments. The most spectacular use of the moratorium was the proclamation of bank holidays in many states, February and March, 1933, followed by similar action on the part of the Federal Government (see *Banking Crisis of 1933*). In several states, moratoriums were used to prevent the depletion of the liquid resources of insurance companies.

The Constitution forbids impairment of the obligation of contract²⁰ by the states, the evils of which had been evident in the post-Revolutionary depression of 1783-87, and many of the enactments of 1931-33 were contested on this ground. In *Home Building and Loan Association v. Blaisdell* (290 U. S. 398, 1934) the Supreme Court, by a five to four vote, upheld the Minnesota Mortgage Moratorium²¹ on grounds of its temporary and emergency character, its reasonableness in protecting creditor rights, and because it afforded protection to the general interests of the community imperiled by the existing situation.

[Files and index of *Commercial and Financial Chronicle*, 1931-33.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Moravian Massacre (1782). See Gnadenhutten.

Moravian Town, Battle at. See Thames, Battle of.

Moravians. The name generally applied in America and England to a German-speaking sect of Protestants, known originally as *The Unitas Fratrum* or *The Unity of the Brethren*. This evangelical church arose in eastern Bohemia before the Reformation; spread to Moravia, Poland and Austria; was almost crushed out of existence during the Thirty Years' War; and was revived on the Saxon estate of Count Zinzendorf in the first half of the 18th century. Their desire to escape persecution and their missionary zeal led Zinzendorf, their leader, to make an agreement with the Georgia Trustees, whereby a colony of Moravians was to be planted in Georgia, with the assurance that they would not be required to bear arms. Bishop Augustus Gottlieb Spangenberg and nine of his followers landed in Savannah in 1735, followed by twenty-seven other Moravians during the next five years. The outbreak of war in Georgia in 1739 made the Moravians very unhappy and they removed to Pennsylvania in 1740. The next year they purchased land in "the Forks of the Delaware" and founded

the town of Nazareth. Meantime, other Moravians from Europe, including Count Zinzendorf, were arriving in the province, and a large tract of land was purchased at the junction of the Lehigh River and Monocacy Creek, where the town of Bethlehem was begun about 1741. This settlement grew rapidly, having 800 settlers by 1756, and from the first it has been the Moravian center in America. By 1775 there were about 2500 Moravians in Pennsylvania. At first the Bethlehem and Nazareth Moravians adopted a communism of labor, called the General Economy, with the lands being owned by the Church, its members working them and receiving in return the necessities of life. This plan was abandoned in 1762.

In 1752 the Bethlehem Moravians sent out a party headed by Spangenberg to select a place for settlement in North Carolina. After a careful survey the party selected a tract of about 100,000 acres, which Spangenberg named Wachovia. This land was purchased from Lord Granville in August, 1753, and a few months later the town of Betharaba²² was founded by twelve Moravians from Bethlehem. Bethania and Salem were founded a few years later, and the latter town, now a part of Winston-Salem, became the Moravian center of the South.

The Moravians stressed missionary work among the Indians more than any other religious body in the English colonies. Quite early they established churches and mission schools among the Pennsylvania Indians and also among the Mohicans, Iroquois and other New York tribes. During the French and Indian War the Pennsylvania government gave special protection to the "Moravian Indians." Although conscientiously opposed to war, the Moravians have rendered valuable assistance in wartime.

The Moravians have always emphasized education. Linden Hall at Lititz, a boarding school for girls, was started in 1749; the same year a Seminary for Young Ladies was founded at Bethlehem; Nazareth Hall, a boys' boarding school, began in 1759. Salem Female Academy was founded in 1802. At present the Church maintains one theological seminary, one college for men, two colleges for women and a number of smaller schools. The Moravians probably had the most highly developed church music in colonial America.

On Jan. 1, 1937, there were 37,953 members of the Moravian Church in the United States, 16,790 in Europe and 147,820 in various foreign missions.

[J. T. Hamilton, *A History of the Moravian Church*.]

HUGH T. LEFLER

Morey Letter, THE, was a campaign document in the election of 1880 in which James A. Garfield was purported to have declared himself in favor of "Chinese cheap labor." While it was immediately denounced as a forgery, agitation over the issue of Chinese exclusion⁹⁰ was so intense on the West Coast that the suggestion that Garfield might support free immigration has been held responsible for his loss of the electoral votes of California. The forged letter was first published in the *New York Truth*, Oct. 20, 1880.

[T. C. Smith, *The Life and Letters of James A. Garfield.*]

FOSTER RHEA DULLES

Morfit's Report. President Jackson sent Henry M. Morfit to Texas in 1836 to obtain information upon which to base a recommendation for or against recognition of Texan independence. Morfit's written report consisted of ten letters, dated in Texas between Aug. 13 and Sept. 14, 1836. On the basis of these letters and a conversation with Morfit on his return to Washington, Jackson recommended delay.

[*House Exec. Doc.* No. 35, 24 Cong., 2 Sess., Serial No. 302; also Serial No. 297.]

E. C. BARKER

Morfontaine, Treaty of. See Convention of 1800.

Morgan, Fort, Seizure of. See Mobile Bay, Battle of.

Morgan-Belmont Agreement was a contract (Feb. 8, 1895) between the United States Treasury Department and the banking houses of J. P. Morgan and Belmont, American representative of the Rothschilds of Paris, whereby these financiers agreed to buy \$62,000,000 thirty-year government bonds and pay for them in gold, thus replenishing the Government's rapidly diminishing gold reserve.

[D. R. Dewey, *National Problems*; A. Nevins, *Grover Cleveland*; G. Cleveland, *Presidential Problems.*]

P. ORMAN RAY

Morgan Trials (1827-31). The disappearance of William Morgan of Batavia, N. Y., in September, 1826, as he was about to publish a book revealing the secrets of Freemasonry, led to a prolonged investigation and numerous court trials. It was believed that Masons had abducted and perhaps murdered him. A special prosecutor was appointed by the governor, but it proved impossible to determine Morgan's fate or satisfactorily to place responsibility. Several Masons pleaded guilty of conspiracy in abducting Morgan and were given jail sentences and fined; others re-

fused to testify and were imprisoned for contempt. The inconclusive trials and the suspicion aroused contributed to the Anti-Masonic movement⁹¹.

[Rob Morris, *William Morgan*; Samuel D. Greene, *The Broken Seal.*]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Morgan's Raids (1862-64). After taking part in some minor engagements as a Confederate cavalry leader, Col. John Hunt Morgan began his real career as a raider by a spectacular dash into Kentucky from Knoxville, Tenn., July, 1862, going as far as Georgetown and Cynthiana and causing alarm in Cincinnati and Lexington before retiring with 1200 men across the Cumberland after having destroyed quantities of Federal arms and supplies with little actual fighting. He assisted Kirby Smith's northward advance in September, 1862 (see Kentucky, Invasion of), captured a Federal force at Hartsville, Tenn., in December and continued his activities the next spring, but his most spectacular achievement came in July, 1863, when he led 2460 men across Kentucky, reaching the Ohio River in five days. Without authority from his superiors and pursued by Federal cavalry, he crossed the Ohio River at Brandenburg, Ky., drove off some Indiana militia, dashed northeastward into Ohio at Harrison, and passing through the suburbs of Cincinnati at night, bewildered Federal and state forces by the speed of his march and the boldness of his plan. His dash across southern Ohio ended disastrously in a battle at the ford at Buffington Island⁹² but Morgan and 1200 men escaped, only to be captured finally at Salineville, Ohio, on July 26. After several months' confinement in the Ohio penitentiary Morgan escaped, with six others, to resume his military career as commander of the Department of Southwestern Virginia. His raiding activities ended suddenly when he was surprised and killed in eastern Tennessee, September, 1864. His raid of 1863 had given Indiana and Ohio a bad fright, had inflicted property damages of over \$500,000 in Ohio, and had helped relieve the pressure on the Confederate forces in Tennessee.

[Whitelaw Reid, *Ohio in the War*; B. W. Duke, *History of Morgan's Cavalry.*]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Mormon, The Book of, is said by Mormons⁹³ to be a translation, by Joseph Smith, of the sacred history of the aborigines of the American Indians who were, at the time the history was written, a white people with inspired prophets similar to those among the Hebrews, from whom it is said they descended. Joseph Smith claimed that this record was delivered to him by an angel in the

year 1827, who gave him instructions by which he was able to translate the engravings as the *Book of Mormon*. This work is held by the Mormons as sacred and equal in authority with the Bible as the word of the Lord.

[*Documentary History of the Mormon Church.*]

J. F. SMITH

Mormon Battalion, THE, was a company of United States soldiers who served in the War with Mexico (1846-48). They were enlisted from the Mormon camps in Iowa Territory, and were furnished by Brigham Young. In all, there were 549 persons, including several families, who marched to Fort Leavenworth^o, where the battalion was properly equipped with clothing and firearms. Under the command of Col. Philip St. George Cooke, the Mormon volunteers marched to California by way of Santa Fé and the Gila River. Due to short rations, lack of water and excessive toil in road making and well digging, there was much sickness, and some deaths. San Diego, Calif., was reached in January, 1847, where the battalion was disbanded, and most of the members joined the Mormon company under Brigham Young, which had arrived in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, July, 1847.

[Orson F. Whitney, *History of Utah.*]

L. E. YOUNG

Mormon Expedition, THE (1857-58), was caused by the refusal of the Mormons^o, led by Brigham Young, to obey Federal laws. President Buchanan ordered the 5th and 10th Infantry and two batteries of Artillery from Fort Leavenworth^o, Kans., to subdue them; the force totaled about 1500 officers and men. The 2nd Dragoons were to follow with Col. Albert Sidney Johnston, designated as commander of the expedition. The lateness of the season, it was September before the troops crossed Green River, and the guerrilla tactics of the Mormons compelled the troops to go into winter camp near Fort Bridger^o. Col. Johnston arrived at the fort on Nov. 11; despite continuous Mormon depredations on Federal supplies, he found that by strict rationing his force could remain there until the following summer. However, the shortage of animals caused by hardships of the journey and Mormon raids was serious and on Nov. 27, 1857, Capt. Marcy^o and thirty-five volunteers started an almost incredible journey to Fort Massachusetts, N. Mex., from which they returned on June 8, 1858, with 1500 horses and mules and an escort of five companies of infantry and mounted riflemen. Meanwhile, promises of amnesty by President Buchanan, coupled with the threat of Federal military in-

tervention, induced Young and his followers to submit, and on June 26, 1858, Col. Johnston's expedition marched into Salt Lake City without bloodshed.

[W. A. Ganoe, *The History of the United States Army*; W. A. Linn, *The Story of the Mormons.*]

C. A. WILLOUGHBY

Mormon Handcart Companies. In the early immigration of the Latter-day Saints from the eastern states and Europe to Salt Lake City, those with insufficient means to procure horses resorted to the use of handcarts after reaching Iowa City, from which point the companies continued on their way a distance of 1300 miles. One or two persons were assigned to each handcart which they pushed and pulled across the dreary wastes to the Salt Lake Valley, the average daily journey being about twenty miles. Most of these companies successfully made the journey, but two companies, which started late in the summer of 1856, were caught in the early winter storms and some of the members perished before rescuing parties, sent out from Salt Lake City, arrived with food and clothing. Travel by handcarts commenced in 1856 and continued until 1860.

[J. F. Smith, *Essentials in Church History*; O. F. Whitney, *History of Utah.*]

J. F. SMITH

Mormon Trail. The Mormons^o, after their expulsion from Nauvoo^o, Ill., in February, 1846, took a westerly route along a well-beaten trail, through what is now Iowa, to the Missouri River. By permission of the Omaha Indians, they crossed the Missouri River into Nebraska Territory, and established winter quarters, where they remained during the winter of 1846-47. In April, 1847, the first company, consisting of 143 men, 3 women and 2 children, started west, under the leadership of Brigham Young. They followed the north bank of the Platte River to Fort Laramie^o. At this point they continued their journey over the old Oregon Trail^o, until they reached Fort Bridger^o in Wyoming. Traveling to the southwest through Echo Canyon to the Weber River, they ascended East Canyon, crossed Big and Little Mountains of the Wasatch Range, and entered the valley of the Great Salt Lake through Emigration Canyon, on July 24, 1847.

[Orson F. Whitney, *History of Utah.*]

L. E. YOUNG

Mormon War, THE (1844-46), was a series of disorders between the Mormon residents of Nauvoo^o in Hancock County, Ill., and the non-Mormon population of the neighboring territory. Upon their settlement at Nauvoo in 1839 the Mormons had been warmly welcomed, but re-

sentment at the excessively liberal terms of their city charter, fear of their political power, which they demonstrated by mass voting, and envy of their apparent prosperity soon generated suspicion and then hate on the part of the non-Mormon population.

By June, 1844, mutual antagonism had reached such a pitch that the Mormon militia was under arms in Nauvoo, while at least 1500 armed men, bent on the expulsion of the Mormons, had assembled in the county. The situation was so critical that Gov. Thomas Ford took personal charge. When Joseph Smith, leader of the sect, surrendered on a charge of riot, a peaceful solution appeared possible, but on June 27 Smith and his brother Hyrum were murdered by a mob in the county jail at Carthage. The state militia, however, kept peace throughout the winter of 1844-45. The summer of 1845 was relatively quiet, but violence flared in the fall, and the militia was called out again. On Oct. 1 the Mormons promised to leave Illinois in the following spring. Their migration commenced in February and continued steadily, but the anti-Mormons, professing to believe that many intended to remain, moved in force against the city in the fall of 1846. A general engagement, with several casualties, resulted. Peace was patched up and the Mormons hastened their exodus. By mid-December, when nearly all had gone, the trouble came to an end.

[E. B. Greene and C. M. Thompson, *Governors' Letter Books, 1840-1853*, *Illinois Historical Collections*, VII; W. A. Linn, *The Story of the Mormons*; T. C. Pease, *The Frontier State, 1818-1848*.]

PAUL M. ANGLE

Mormonism is the body of doctrine of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly called Mormons[™]. Some of the fundamental doctrines are as follows: It is claimed that through visitations of heavenly messengers to Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery and others, their church was organized in 1830, after the pattern of the primitive Christian Church. They teach that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost are separate personages, and that man was created bodily in the image of God. Jesus Christ is accepted as the Redeemer of the world through whom there shall come a universal resurrection of the dead. Salvation is based on strict obedience to all the laws and ordinances of the gospel. The foundation principles are: first, faith in God; second, repentance from all sin; third, baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; fourth, laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. A man must be divinely called and given authority in order to officiate in these ordinances. The *Book of Mormon*[™] they claim to be a sacred history of

the ancestors of the Indians, and, with the Doctrine and Covenants containing revelations to Joseph Smith, is received on an equality with the Bible as the word of God. The saving grace of the gospel is not confined to men in this present world, but extends beyond the grave to all who have died without a knowledge of it and who are willing to receive it in the spirit world. As Christ went to preach to the dead when his body lay in the tomb, so His servants are preaching to the dead, for whom ordinances may be performed vicariously on earth. Marriage, they teach, should be for eternity as well as for time, and the family organization is to remain intact after the resurrection.

[James E. Talmage, *Articles of Faith; Documentary History of the Church*.]

J. F. SMITH

Mormons, a common pseudonym for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, which was organized by Joseph Smith and five others at Fayette, N. Y., April 6, 1830. Being troubled in spirit over the question of salvation, one day in the spring of 1820 Joseph Smith retired to the woods and earnestly prayed. Soon, he said, he was surrounded by a brilliant light and two glorious personages stood above him in the air. One of them spoke to him calling him by name and, pointing to the other, said: "This is my beloved Son, hear him." He then asked the personage which of all the churches he should join in order to obtain salvation, and was told to join none of them. He declared that he was also told to wait and eventually the fulness of the gospel which had been withdrawn from men would be restored. Returning to his home he made these things known to his parents who believed him, but when he presented them to the leaders of religion he met with harsh treatment and was told that there was no need for the appearing of heavenly beings in those days, therefore he was deceived. From that time opposition against him commenced and his life was sought by enemies.

Three years later he again proclaimed that the heavens had been opened to him and that on Sept. 21, 1823, a heavenly messenger, who said his name was Moroni, appeared and quoted freely from the Bible and said that many of the sayings of the ancient prophets were about to be fulfilled. This messenger, Joseph said, informed him of a record, engraved on plates of gold, buried in a hill, not far from his home, which was the sacred history of the ancient inhabitants of the Western World. After several visits from this angel, covering a period of four years, the record was placed in his hands by the messenger

who also gave him the Urim and Thummim, prepared for the purpose of translating the record. By the aid of these instruments and with the help of Oliver Cowdery, a young man near Joseph's own age, he said he translated the record which was published in 1830, as the *Book of Mormon*⁹⁰.

The Latter-day Saints claim that this book contains the gospel taught among the people on the American continent before and immediately subsequent to the days of Christ, who visited these people after His resurrection, and established His Church among them.

Joseph Smith now had a witness in Oliver Cowdery, and these two men claimed that while engaged in the work of translating they received a visitation from John the Baptist, in May, 1829, who conferred upon them the "Aaronic Priesthood," which is the authority given to Aaron and his sons. Later that same year, the "Melchizedek Priesthood" was conferred upon them by heavenly messengers. By this authority and the command of the Lord, they said, they organized the Church April 6, 1830. From that day forth it grew rapidly. When the membership numbered several hundred souls, headquarters were transferred to Kirtland, Ohio. Settlements were also attempted in Jackson County, Mo., where, the Mormons teach, the city of Zion, or New Jerusalem, is eventually to be built.

From the first, persecution followed this band of Mormons. The bitterness of the Missourians against them became intense, partly due to their religion and partly because they were abolitionists. By the summer of 1833 a large settlement of Mormons had been made in Jackson County. In July of that year they were ruthlessly driven from their homes. For a short time they found refuge in Ray County, but persecution followed them and they were forced to move to a sparsely settled portion of Missouri in Daviess and Caldwell counties. In 1838, spurred on by the bitterness of their enemies, Gov. Lilburn W. Boggs issued an exterminating order against the Latter-day Saints and demanded that they leave the state forthwith. Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum, with other leaders, were taken prisoners, court-martialed by the mob-militia and ordered shot, although they were not men of arms and were not engaged in rebellion. This order was given to Col. Alexander W. Doniphan to execute; disobeying his superior officer, he said: "It is cold-blooded murder. I will not obey your order. My brigade shall march for Liberty tomorrow morning, at 8 o'clock; and if you execute these men, I will hold you responsible before an earthly tribunal, so help me God." His action calmed the feelings against the Mormons and

saved the lives of the Smiths. They were, however, thrown into prison and kept there six months, enduring many hardships before they were released, no real charge having been sustained against them.

At the time of the exodus from Missouri the Church numbered about 12,000 souls. Their property was confiscated and, poverty-stricken, they sought refuge in Illinois. On the banks of the Mississippi they built the city of Nauvoo⁹¹ and began to prosper. A liberal charter was received from the state. They founded a university and commenced to build a temple which, when completed, cost \$1,000,000. The bitterness which followed them while in Missouri still pursued them, and their enemies stirred up many of the citizens of Illinois who joined in the opposition against the Church, which finally resulted in the murder of the Smiths, at Carthage, Ill., June 27, 1844, while awaiting trial on charges made by their enemies (*see* Mormon War).

Brigham Young became the presiding officer after the death of the Smiths. He took command, and order was restored. In 1845 hostilities again broke out and the Mormons were forced again from their homes. In the month of February, 1846, the first bands of refugees crossed the Mississippi River, with cannon pointing at them to hasten their flight. In poverty and inclement weather they commenced their journey westward, seeking a more friendly locality. Temporary settlements were formed in the territory of Iowa, and in the spring of 1847 the first company of 143 men pushed on westward in search of a new home (*see* Mormon Trail). This company arrived in the Salt Lake Valley, July 24, 1847. Later that same year other companies arrived and, because of the proximity of the inland sea, the settlement was called Salt Lake City. From this point the people radiated in all directions making settlements in many parts of the Rocky Mountains. Contrary to the impression of some writers, the Mormons in migrating were not attempting to get out of United States territory, but only to be removed from persecution.

It was claimed that during the Nauvoo period Joseph Smith received a revelation on "celestial marriage," including plural marriage, or that it is in accord with the will of heaven, under proper conditions, for a man to have more than one wife. Celestial marriage is marriage for eternity. This practice resulted in great opposition and Congress passed laws prohibiting it. After these laws were declared constitutional, the Mormon people, by proclamation of President Wilford Woodruff in 1890, abandoned the practice of plural marriage (*see* Polygamy).

Brigham Young died in 1877 and was succeeded by John Taylor. Since that time there have been four other presidents of the Church, namely, Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, Joseph F. Smith and Heber J. Grant who now presides.

[*Documentary History of the Mormon Church.*]

J. F. SMITH

Mormons. See Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Moros, THE, of the Philippine Islands are, in their various branches, known as Sulus, Palawan, Magindanao, Lanao, Yakan, Sanggil (the last three inhabiting the Island of Mindanao) and Samal (who live among the Sulus and in several other regions). They are Mohammedans, fanatical, generally ignorant, revengeful and hostile to Christians, but they are fine fighting men and one who runs *amok* is dangerous. The Sulus represent the highest culture stage among the Moros. During the American regime, the Moros were governed at first by a special military, and later by civil, government. They are now under the government of the Philippine Commonwealth.

[H. O. Beyer, *Population of the Philippine Islands.*]

JAMES A. ROBERTSON

Morrill Act. Long agitation by agricultural societies, farm journals^{qv} and other advocates of vocation training for farmers and mechanics—Jonathan Baldwin Turner of Illinois being the most important—influenced Justin S. Morrill of Vermont to introduce into Congress a bill to aid in the establishment of agricultural and mechanical arts colleges in every state in the Union. The measure passed Congress in 1858, but constitutional objections induced President Buchanan to veto it. A similar measure, since called the Morrill Act, was signed by President Lincoln in 1862. States were offered 30,000 acres of land for each representative and senator they were entitled to in the national legislature, as an endowment for the proposed schools. In some states the lands were given to existing institutions, as in Wisconsin where the state university was the beneficiary; elsewhere they were conveyed to newly established agricultural and technical colleges such as Purdue University or the Illinois Industrial University, now the University of Illinois. Sen. Morrill was henceforth called the "Father of the Agricultural Colleges." (See also Land Grants for Education.)

[E. D. Ross, *The "Father" of the Land-Grant College, Agricultural History*, April, 1938; B. H. Hibbard, *History of the Public Land Policies.*]

PAUL WALLACE GATES

Morrill Tariff Act. The bill was passed by the House on May 10, 1860. It was a protectionist measure aimed at getting Pennsylvania and other manufacturing states to support Lincoln in the election of 1860. After secession^{qv} had removed many senators, it passed the Senate and became a law March 2, 1861. The act restored the ad valorem duties to about the level of those in the act of 1846 and also gave increased protection in the specific duties.

[F. W. Taussig, *Tariff History of the United States.*]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Morris Canal and Banking Company, THE, was organized in 1824 to build a canal across New Jersey from the mouth of the Lehigh River to New York harbor, thus giving a direct water route to the seaboard for Lehigh coal. The canal, completed in 1832, was one of the engineering wonders of America. In its 90-mile course, it passed over an elevation of 914 feet above tide-water, largely through the agency of 23 inclined planes designed by James Renwick, a professor in Columbia College, which carried the boats up and down steep grades on tram cars. The banking privilege in the company's charter brought it into disgrace and ruin. During the speculative mania of 1835-36, it bought large quantities of the bonds issued by Indiana and Michigan for internal improvement^{qv} purposes, sold them and, instead of paying the states, used the money for the extension and improvement of its canal. Two Indiana officials, one of them a stockholder in the Morris Company, aided in the jobbery and participated in the profits. The Panic of 1837^{qv} compelled the company to mortgage the canal for \$750,000, and in 1841 it collapsed in one of the most noisome bankruptcies of the period, owing the State of Indiana alone \$2,536,611—a very serious matter for so young a commonwealth in those days. In 1844 a new canal and banking company was organized. After 1866 the business of the canal declined because of railroad competition. It was leased to the Lehigh Valley Railroad in 1871, was taken over by the state in 1904 and in 1924 was obliterated.

[Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Towpaths.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Morristown, Encampment at. The natural fortress of the Watchung Mountains to the south, roads leading to the Hudson and Delaware rivers, proximity of important iron works and a powder mill, and the residents' patriotism, determined the selection of Morristown, N. J., as a camp site for the Continental Army during the winters of 1776-77 and 1779-80. The first troops, three regi-

ments from Ticonderoga, arrived Dec. 17, 1776. These were joined on Jan. 6, 1777, by the main army of about 4000 men, fresh from Trenton^{er} and Princeton^{er}. With headquarters at Jacob Arnold's tavern, Washington located the general camp at Lowantica Valley (now Spring Valley), one-and-a-half miles southeast of the town. Suffering from smallpox and depleted by desertions the army remained here until late May. Two years later (1779-80) the army was encamped from November until early June at Jockey Hollow^{er}, four miles southwest of the general's headquarters at the Jacob Ford Mansion.

[A. M. Sherman, *Historic Morristown*.]

G. A. TITUS

Morse Geographies. In 1784 the first publication appeared under the title *Geography Made Easy*. It was the work of Jedediah Morse, New England politician and divine, also known as the "father of American Geography." The little book was the first geography to be published in the United States. As the title implies, *Geography Made Easy* attempted to simplify existing notions about America, which were poorly treated in English geographies. More than twenty-five editions were published during the author's lifetime. Other publications followed the first. An enlarged work, *The American Geography*, later called *The American Universal Geography*, appeared in 1789. A child's book, *Elements of Geography*, appeared in 1795, and in 1797 *The American Gazetteer* was published. All of these works were re-edited and reprinted many times.

[W. B. Sprague, *The Life of Jedediah Morse*.]

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS

Mortars, The Civil War Naval, heavy guns designed to throw shells with a high angle of fire, were built at Pittsburgh in 1862 for use in the New Orleans campaign (see Mississippi, Opening of the). They were mounted on twenty schooners, one mortar to a schooner, and, escorted by six steamers, were brought to the Mississippi Passes in April, 1862, by Commander David Dixon Porter. From April 16 to 24 they bombarded Forts Jackson and St. Philip, the principal defenses below New Orleans, with 13-inch shells, throwing in all 16,800 shells. The forts' buildings were burned, the casemates flooded, the cannon dismounted, fourteen Confederates were killed, and thirty-nine wounded. The mortar bombardment materially aided Admiral Farragut in passing the forts with the Union fleet. After New Orleans' surrender, the flotilla ascended the Mississippi to Vicksburg^{er}, which, from June 27 to July 9, 1862, it bombarded, enabling

Farragut's fleet to run past the city. During the siege of Vicksburg the following year, a mortar fleet bombarded the city for forty-two days prior to its surrender, throwing 7000 shells into the beleaguered town. Admiral Porter claimed that the mortar firing was one of the main factors in forcing the surrender. At the close of the war the navy possessed twenty-six such mortars.

[R. S. West, *The Second Admiral: A Life of David Dixon Porter*; D. D. Porter, *Naval History of the Civil War*.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Mortgages for many centuries have been a device for providing security for loans. Such documents are used not only in connection with property in land, but in buildings, equipment, homes, chattels, and, to an enormous extent in recent years, with intangibles. In fact, notably since 1880, many new forms of property have appeared. To an increasing extent these have served as a basis for the building of a huge debt structure. In these respects the history of mortgages is connected with the evolution of both business and social life. Particularly since 1910 installment selling^{er} has opened a great new field for the use of mortgage documents.

These changes have greatly complicated the debtor-creditor relation and in numerous instances, over the years, have been the basis for bitter controversies between borrowers and lenders, and have led to demand for readjustments in these relations. But, on the whole, throughout American history both legislatures and courts have stood rather firmly on the sacredness of contract, although at times both these authorities, either by direction or indirection, have sought to relieve debtors while still holding to the general principles of mortgage obligations.

Relief has taken a number of forms, such as the grant of delay—stay laws and moratoria—either in the payment of interest or principal, or both; sometimes also by statutory provisions which enabled debtors and creditors, under the guidance of the courts, to compose their differences, usually with concessions to debtors. On various occasions relief has been sought and sometimes granted in less obvious ways than by direct alteration of the terms of the loan. Laws to operate on the money factor have been outstanding cases of this description. Legislative measures to cheapen money have usually had for one purpose the raising of prices, thereby giving debtors more nominal value with which to pay, or more directly, through the depreciation of the money medium, cheapening the means of payment while maintaining the face value of the promise to pay. In the same connection, such laws have often

contained legal tender⁹⁷ provisions which compelled creditors either to take depreciated money or to wait until some future time for the repayment of their claims. In the colonies, paper money⁹⁸ was sometimes used as a means of meeting expenses when taxes failed to cover present needs; but in many instances such issues had as their purpose the relief of debtors. Thus in the words of one historian: "It was the age-old story of a state [Maryland] where business was static and debts and poverty prevalent striving to satisfy the clamor of the debtor class for easy money and to put new life into industry." In our later history the story of the Greenback party and the prolonged struggle over the silver issue which gave us such laws as the Bland-Allison Act (1878) and the Sherman Silver Purchase Act (1890)⁹⁹ were merely a repetition of this ancient struggle. The reduction of the weight of the gold dollar from 25.8 to 15 5/21 grains, 0.9 fine (President's proclamation, Jan. 31, 1934) was for the immediate purpose of stimulating a rise of prices, but with the latent intention of relieving debtors (*see* Devaluation).

Laws covering the debtor-creditor relation emanate from both Federal and state governments. In periods of economic distress the states have been unusually active in providing relief laws. They largely follow the same pattern, but vary in detail. In old Virginia when land mortgages fell in default appraisers were appointed to value the property. A common provision was that land could not be sold at auction unless it would bring one half, or some other fraction, of the appraised value. Failing an offer price at auction which would cover the legal fraction of the appraised value, the property was restored to the debtor, usually for a period of one year. One can find various points of similarity between these early laws and those enacted during the depression years from 1929 to 1934. The Minnesota Moratorium Law¹⁰⁰ (approved April 18, 1933) provided postponement of foreclosure sales and extension of the period under which property sold under foreclosure could be redeemed; the courts were vested with power to decide what was a just and reasonable extension time; also to name a reasonable income for rental value which the mortgagor was to make to the mortgage holder. This and similar laws enacted elsewhere were regarded as emergency measures. A Federal act (approved Aug. 28, 1935), which amended the Federal Bankruptcy Act of 1898 (*see* Bankruptcy Laws), also contained in general form many of the time-old provisions, but with considerable variation of detail. Among other things this act provided that under conditions stated in the law

the court should stay all judicial and official proceedings against the debtor or any of his property for three years; but the debtor was required to pay a reasonable rental semiannually on the property. The Corporate Reorganization Act (approved June, 1934), a rather lengthy affair, contained various provisions for the relief of debtors.

The years subsequent to the Panic of 1929¹⁰¹ added new crimps to relief legislation, such as governmental lending in one form or another to debtor classes, the refinancing of loans on farms and homes at lower than former interest rates, and loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation¹⁰² to banks, industries, railroads, among others.

[W. G. Sumner, *History of Banking in the United States*, Vol. I; M. S. Wildman, *History of Money Inflation in the United States*.]

ISAAC LIPPINCOTT

Mortimer, Fort. This post was built on the upper Missouri at the present site of the old military post of Fort Buford. This site was first occupied by Fort William, a trading post belonging to the St. Louis firm of Sublette and Campbell. Fort William was built in 1833 and abandoned in 1834 when the firm sold out to the American Fur Company¹⁰³ (*see* Union, Fort).

A New York firm, Fox, Livingston Company, organized the Union Fur Company, being induced to take this step by the favorable representations made to them by a fur trader, Ebbetts, who had succeeded during 1841 in carrying on a very successful trade in opposition to the American Fur Company. In the spring of 1842 the new company sent the steamboat *New Haven* up the Missouri River with a complete outfit for establishing opposition posts. They established Fort George, just below the mouth of the Cheyenne River and Fort Mortimer on the site of old Fort William. Ebbetts and Cutting represented the firm on the upper Missouri. After the three years of unsuccessful competition the firm sold out to the American Fur Company and Fort Mortimer was abandoned in 1845.

[H. M. Chittenden, *The American Fur Trade of the Far West*; Charles Larpenteur, *Forty Years a Fur Trader on the Upper Missouri River*.]

O. G. LIBBY

Mosby's Rangers, an irregular body of Confederate troops commanded by Col. John S. Mosby, operated, 1863-65, south of the Potomac behind the Union lines. This organization began with a scouting assignment from J. E. B. Stuart (C.) in January, 1863. From a few troopers the Rangers gradually grew to eight companies in 1865. Apart from participation with Stuart in the Gettysburg campaign¹⁰⁴, their main activities consist-

ed of sudden attacks on Union outposts, followed, when pursued, by quick dispersion. To Sheridan, Custer and others, Mosby's men were a veritable thorn in the flesh. Efforts to destroy the Rangers were provokingly unavailing.

[James J. Williamson, *Mosby's Rangers, A Record of the Forty-Third Battalion Virginia Cavalry*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Moses His Judicials. This earliest compilation of New England legislation was prepared by John Cotton and presented to the general court of Massachusetts Bay^{as} in October, 1636. Although bulwarked by many scriptural citations, it was not of Biblical origin but embodied the trading-company government, the early laws and the practices of Massachusetts. Only the chapters dealing with inheritance and the punishment of crime were drawn from the Bible. Although eventually rejected by Massachusetts in favor of the Body of Liberties^{as} adopted in 1641, during the years when the compilation was under consideration copies of it were carried to New Haven, Southampton and possibly Portsmouth, R. I., where it received at least partial acceptance, and it was not without influence upon the Body of Liberties.

The Cotton Code was published as *An Abstract or (sic) the Lawes of New England* (London, 1641), and as *An Abstract of Laws and Government* (London, 1655). It was republished in Thomas Hutchinson, *A Collection of Original Papers* (Boston, 1769); Massachusetts Historical Society *Collections*, V (Boston, 1798); and Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers*, III (Washington, 1844), No. 9.

[I. M. Calder, John Cotton's Moses His Judicials, Colonial Society of Massachusetts *Publications*, XXVIII.]

ISABEL M. CALDER

Mosquito Fleet, THE, was a small naval squadron selected by Commodore David Porter in 1823 to wipe out the West Indian pirates. The fleet consisted of eight small schooners, a steamer, a transport ship and five barges. The fleet scoured the coasts of Santo Domingo, Cuba, and part of Yucatan thoroughly, but encountered few pirates. Yellow fever broke out in August, 1823, and Porter was obliged to sail north. He returned in 1824 and made several captures, but was succeeded by Commodore Lewis Warrington, who captured a pirate vessel and destroyed a pirate stronghold. By 1829 the fleet had captured about sixty-five pirate craft, virtually destroying their power.

[F. B. C. Bradlee, *Piracy in the West Indies and Its Suppression*; E. S. Maclay, *A History of the United States Navy from 1775 to 1894*.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Mosquito Question, THE, was one of the several delicate issues between Britain and the United States involving rivalry for the dominance of the Caribbean. Mosquito comprised the present east coast of Nicaragua, strategically located for a canal. An Indian tribe inhabited only a small portion, the remainder having been taken up by English traders. To supervise the relations between the natives and the whites the British government in 1844 converted a long-standing tradition of protection over the tribe into a formal protectorate.

American jealousy was aroused in 1849, when Nicaragua was seen to be a vital link in American intercoastal communications (*see* Hise Treaty; Squier Treaty). The issue thus joined was the occasion for the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty^{as}, a clever formula instituting an alliance between the two countries under cover of which the Mosquito and other Central American issues were to be settled and the entire region neutralized. The Mosquito question thenceforth became inseparable from the general Central American question, the United States presently putting a Monroe Doctrine^{as} interpretation on the treaty and Britain maintaining her right to continue supervision in behalf of the Mosquitoes. Honors were even in 1860 when Mosquito was incorporated into Nicaragua, but a Reserve was created for the Indians with guarantees. The guarantees were terminated in 1895 by arrangement between Britain and Nicaragua.

[J. B. Moore, *Digest of International Law*, III; R. W. Van Alstyne, The Central American Policy of Lord Palmerston, *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XVI.]

RICHARD W. VAN ALSTYNE

Mosquitoes. The hum of the mosquito was heard in early America, frightening the hardest woodsman and terrorizing the most daring horseman of the prairies. Yet at this time the female mosquito was known only as a pest and not as a conveyer of disease. The leader of the medical profession, Benjamin Rush, passing through epidemics of cruel dengue or breakbone fever (1790), and devastations of yellow fever (1793), saw many mosquitoes, but never connected them with disease. Throughout the 19th century the mosquital transmission of disease found few advocates. The theory of John Crawford (1790), that malaria, yellow fever^{as} and dysentery may be caused by tiny insects, was so much at variance with prevailing views that he finally published his conclusions in a nonmedical journal (*Baltimore Observer*, 1806-7). Josiah Clark Nott's suggestion that the night mosquito of the lowlands is responsible for malaria (*New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal*, 1848) was received with indif-

ference, and Alfred Freeman Africanus King's recommendation (1882) that the national capital be enclosed in a city-wide screen as high as the Washington Monument was greeted with laughter. It remained for American army surgeons to demonstrate that the mosquito formerly known as *Stegomyia fasciata*, and now called *Aedes aegypti*, is the transmitting agent of the virus of yellow fever and dengue.

[Leland Ossian Howard, *Mosquitoes of North America*.]

VICTOR ROBINSON

Most-Favored-Nation Principle. One of the fundamental objects of American foreign policy⁹⁰ from the beginning has been to break through the dykes of colonial trade monopoly and the barriers of discriminatory national tariffs. The first expression of this was the so-called conditional most-favored-nation article, which was inserted into the treaty of amity and commerce with France of 1778 (*see* Franco-American Alliance), viz: "The most Christian King, and the United States engage mutually not to grant any particular Favour to other Nations in respect of Commerce and Navigation, which shall not immediately become common to the other Party, who shall enjoy the same Favour freely, if the Concession was freely made, or on allowing the same Compensation if the Concession was Conditional." The conditional feature was inserted at the initiative of the French negotiators. The conditional most-favored-nation formula became a standard article of treaties of commerce of the United States whenever it could be secured, until the year 1923, when the Department of State changed over to the unconditional formula.

Before the World War it had become the tendency of European powers to accept the unconditional formula in their treaties, and American theorists argued in favor of this practice as more liberal, and, if universally pursued, more efficacious in lowering tariff walls everywhere. But by the time the reform of American policy had taken place, the European nations, following the World War, in a wave of neo-mercantilism, had gone back to the old conditional most-favored-nation formula. Since then a network of such treaties has been erected, known now as "compensation trade treaties," which, if persisted in, makes American commitments to the new unconditional formula an increasing handicap in the adjustment of international trade rivalries.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Motion Pictures. Coleman Sellers, a Philadelphia mechanical engineer, made in 1860 the first

known attempt to combine photography⁹¹ with the already known principle of the zoetrope. In a series of photographs, he pictured his son in successive moments of the act of driving a nail. He mounted these pictures on the blades of a paddle wheel, revolved it, and obtained the effect of motion, as in the zoetrope. Calling his device the kinetoscope, he patented it in 1861. In 1872 John D. Isaacs contrived a long row of cameras, making exposures as small as 1/2000th of a second, to photograph a horse in motion for Leland Stanford, a California capitalist. In 1889 Thomas A. Edison, who had been working on the problem for two years, procured a 50-foot strip of Eastman's photographic film, just invented, and with this achieved his purpose. His kinetoscope was not exhibited, however, until 1894. It was a peep-show device, and for several years the machines were found in cheap "museums" or grouped with phonographs in "penny arcades." One dropped a coin in a slot and, looking through an aperture, saw a bit of slapstick comedy, often risqué, lasting about thirteen seconds. In 1895 Thomas Armat of Washington built the first crude machine for projecting the pictures on a screen; and as the "Vitascope" it was exhibited at Koster & Bial's music hall in New York on April 23, 1896. The length of the film was now increased to 1000 feet, thus establishing the existing standard unit of one reel, then occupying fifteen minutes. For several years the films were a part of vaudeville programs: street scenes, breaking waves, children playing with pets, President McKinley walking across the White House lawn. These were succeeded by soldiers and battleships in our war with Spain in 1898, thus predicting the current-events film of later years.

Strangely enough, by 1903, public interest in the films was declining—which spurred Edwin S. Porter, an Edison cameraman, to gather all the thrills he could contrive into a reel entitled, *The Life of an American Fireman*. This succeeded so well that he decided to put an original, plotted story into a film, and so produced *The Great Train Robbery*, the first American story picture. With this as its entire program, the first movie theater opened in Pittsburgh in November, 1905, charging five cents admission. Thus a new industry was born, and sprang up almost overnight into giant size. Business rooms were hastily converted into movie theaters, with imaginative names such as Nickelodeon, Nickelo, Theato, Picto, etc., and for the five cents admission, two reels—later, as competition increased, three or four reels—were shown. Never did a new amusement become so quickly and enormously popu-

lar. Several producing companies assumed prominence—Vitagraph, Essanay, Biograph, Lubin, Selig, Kalem, Melies—and their owners rapidly became wealthy. New York and Los Angeles were soon indicated as the two great producing centers, the sunny climate of the latter eventually making it the world's "movie capital" and one of its most important cities. By 1912-13 the Biograph Company, with studios on both coasts, was paying its leading director, David W. Griffith—who, with his cameraman, Bitzer, had originated the close-up, the cutback, the fade-out and the dissolve, all essential to later picture-making—a salary of \$100,000 a year. By 1909 some companies had begun making pictures in two and three reels. Exhibitors at first did not like them, but the longer story was inevitable. In 1912 Adolph Zukor, with the newly organized Famous Players Film Company, really launched the modern multiple reel film with his production of *Queen Elizabeth*, starring Sarah Bernhardt. The new technique leaped into popularity immediately and, within a year or two, theater admission prices were rising to ten cents and higher. With the earliest increase in footage came a tendency to exploit nudity and eroticism to such an extent that boards of censorship were rapidly formed in most states, and the trend was sharply curbed. Censorship was extreme in its severity for some years, but after 1930 it began to relax somewhat.

In 1914 Griffith made *The Birth of a Nation* in twelve reels, the greatest financial success in film history and still regarded as a masterpiece. This was an era of reckless promotion and many collapses. Huge sums were made and lost. Movie magazines began to be issued for public reading, stars became popular idols, salaries of actors and directors rose to unheard-of levels, and the craving to act in the movies laid hold of a considerable portion of the nation's populace, especially the young. The stage began to feel in decreased attendance the effect of film competition. For years, most stage actors had scorned the movies, but now many of them were lured into the films by new companies, not always with the happiest results; such films as *Don Quixote* with DeWolf Hopper and *Macbeth* with Beerbohm Tree, crudely directed and overlong, being found dull by audiences. The Keystone Comedies, under Mack Sennett, however, introduced to the screen in 1914 an English music hall comedian named Charles S. Chaplin, who proved to be one of the greatest mimic geniuses of modern times. Travel and topical films depicting scenery, folk life in many lands, industries, nature studies and scientific subjects were being made in great numbers by 1915. During the World War the value of the

motion picture as propaganda for and against a cause was amply demonstrated, and it was used with telling effect for recruiting, the sale of Liberty Bonds and the support of the Red Cross. Business, religion and philanthropy took the hint, and after the war the commercial film, publicizing a railroad, a manufactured article, a cult or a welfare drive, became the sole output of a number of companies. Some of these films were used by the schools which had installed projection machines, and were showing pictures classed as "educational." Churches, and then factories and large businesses also, began making motion pictures a part of their program. As to the dramatic pictures, they reached the peak of their prosperity during the decade following the World War. Enormous theaters were built for them, and salaries of stars reached fantastic heights, some being paid \$100,000 or more for working in a single picture. The depression beginning in 1929 curbed the lavish spending only in a limited degree. Edison had in 1913 tried to combine his phonograph with a film to make a talking picture, but the result was unsatisfactory. Continued experimentation, however, resulted in the production of a part-talking picture, *The Jazz Singer*, in 1927, which was pronounced a success; and with that, a new era began. Theaters in the larger cities were "wired for sound" by 1929, but installation in smaller towns came more slowly, and for two or three years two versions of films had to be made—with and without sound. Dramatic pictures in color, long the objects of research and experiment, began to be produced in increasing numbers in 1936.

[Terry Ramsaye, *A Thousand and One Nights*; Paul Rotha, *The Film Till Now*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Motor Bus, THE, succeeded the electric railway^{as} for city street transportation, which in turn had supplanted the horsecar and horse-drawn "bus" (a shortening of the word omnibus). The horse bus or stage, as it was more commonly called, was our first urban transportation vehicle. Though street railways^{as} had been introduced in 1832, there were still twenty-nine bus lines in New York in 1855, and the Broadway line continued until 1885, when replaced by horsecars. The Fifth Avenue buses used horses for twenty-one years longer. The Mack Brothers of Brooklyn, wagon makers, built a motor bus in 1894 which was probably the first one in history, but there was no market for it. Motor vehicles were installed on Fifth Avenue in 1906, and about the same time a sight-seeing bus was built and used in central Oregon. In 1912 the Cleveland Railway Company placed three motor buses in suburbs as

adjuncts to their street car lines. The "jitney bus" appeared in 1914; first, it is said, in Oakland, Calif., where a battered automobile cruised the streets, bearing a placard offering to carry a passenger "anywhere for a jitney"—a California slang term for a nickel. Individual car owners elsewhere quickly took up the idea, and by the early part of 1915 "jitneys" were in use the country over, but with varying fortunes. In some cities they endured only for a few hours or a few days; in others they were highly successful. Cities soon began demanding license fees and bonds, and the jitney lapsed rapidly, passing out almost entirely by 1920. But the fad gave an impetus to the building of real motor buses, and before 1920 they began eliminating trolley cars from city streets. The trackless trolley—really a bus operated by trolleys—seemed to threaten competition in 1922–25, but lacked the motor vehicle's mobility. The building of good roads brought interurban bus lines; and the sight-seeing or "rubberneck wagon" in the cities was by 1922 expanded to a pleasure-touring vehicle covering a thousand miles or more. By 1927 a transcontinental bus line, operating regularly between New York and Los Angeles, became a reality. The buses had now driven out many interurban electric lines⁶⁰ and were offering serious competition to the steam railroads—so much so that after a few years railroads began buying stock in bus companies or taking them over outright. Many railroads eliminated minor branch lines and installed buses in their stead. Of the 4000 common carrier bus companies in operation at the end of 1938, 188 were owned by electric railways and 63 by steam railways. There were then 51,500 buses on public carrier lines and 81,100 serving schools. Of the 385,868 miles of route covered by the passenger buses, 358,056 were in intercity or long-haul service. After 1930 buses displaced street cars with such rapidity that by Dec. 31, 1938, there were 543 cities of 10,000 population and above where buses were the only street transportation.

[*Bus Transportation*, 1922-39; Parker McCollester and Frank J. Clark, *Federal Motor Carrier Regulation*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Motor Carriers Act, THE, was signed by President Roosevelt on Aug. 9, 1935. Save briefly under the National Recovery Act⁶¹, passenger buses and trucks had been unregulated by government, and demands for such regulation had been before Congress since 1926. This law applied to all buses and trucks carrying passengers and freight across state lines, with certain specified exceptions. It provided for control over types of service, prevention of rate-cutting, supervision as to

safety of operation and equipment, maximum working hours and responsibility of operators, for filing of financial reports, checking of security issues, etc. Carriers must procure certificates of public convenience before they operate.

[Parker McCollester and Frank J. Clark, *Federal Motor Carrier Regulation*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Motor Truck Transport. The first so-called delivery wagon, propelled by a one-cylinder gasoline engine, was produced in 1899. This was little more than a passenger car with a box attached over the rear end of the frame. It was equipped with bicycle wheels.

Three years of experiment by several potential manufacturers developed motor trucks to the point where one manufacturer went into "large-scale production" in 1902, and manufactured seventy-five of the vehicles.

In 1904 there were 411 trucks in use in the United States. The vehicles soon began to replace old Dobbin in local cartage work, and as delivery units for department stores, bakeries, grocers and other retail businesses. By 1915 engineering progress had brought truck use to the point where 136,000 units were in service.

Many of the large trucking companies of the present day (1940) bear the same name and are headed by the same families that were in the teamster business before the advent of the motor truck.

Because highways were not adequate and the vehicles had not been developed for long-distance transportation, the average radius of operation of these trucks was twenty miles around municipal areas. Few were known to operate beyond a fifty-mile limit.

The World War was the laboratory which proved the motor truck's utility in covering much greater distances even under the strain of traveling over shell-torn roads with military equipment and supplies.

With improved highways and use of pneumatic tires on trucks following the war, the distribution radius increased. New over-the-road trucking companies sprang up in 1920 during the railroad strike. The demand for highway transportation gave impetus to expansion of truck service between cities. Radius of distribution increased to 150 miles in the early 1920's, and some of the vehicles were in regular operation providing service between communities 150 to 200 miles apart. Practically all of the states had regulations as to safety at that time, and many of them began to adopt laws regulating the business of transportation by motor truck for hire. Bills were introduced in several sessions of Congress for

Federal regulation of interstate common and contract carriers before the Motor Carrier Act, 1935⁷, was enacted.

Under present-day distribution practices, motor trucks are the only means of moving commodities to and from the 48,000 communities that are not served by other transportation agencies.

More than 4,460,000 motor trucks are now (1940) registered. About 3,790,000, or 85%, of these are owned and operated by business and agriculture. Of this number, 1,000,000 are on farms. The remaining 15% are in the service of common and contract carriers.

Development in recent years has been in the use of refrigerated equipment carrying perishable products, use of lighter metal alloys to increase payload, cab-over-engine designs to give a better distribution of the load, and Diesel-powered vehicles adaptable to use for long runs.

[*Automobile Facts and Figures*, 1938; Joseph B. Eastman, *Merchandise Traffic Report*.] ARTHUR C. BUTLER

Moultrie, Fort, Battle of (June 28, 1776). Throughout a ten-hour bombardment, this palmetto fort on Sullivan's Island in Charleston (S. C.) harbor, commanded by Col. Moultrie, successfully beat off a British attack under Clinton and Parker. American loss was slight, while that of the British, both in lives and damage to ships, was large. The victory kept the British out of the South for the next two years.

[Benson J. Lossing, *The Pictorial Field Book of the Revolution*.] ROBERT S. THOMAS

Mounds and Mound Builders. The terms are used to designate respectively the numerous ancient artificial structures of earth and stone, widely scattered over the eastern United States, and the primitive peoples responsible for their construction.

What may be termed the General Mound Area corresponds approximately to the basins of the Mississippi and its tributaries, particularly those to the eastward, and the Gulf and Southeastern seaboard regions. There are few major remains east of the Appalachians, from the Carolinas northward through New England.

In its broader interpretation, the word Mounds comprises all major remains of prehistoric man within the area: conical mounds, truncated mounds, effigy and linear mounds, defensive earthworks, geometric enclosures, and shell heaps. Conical mounds are artificial hillocks of earth, earth and stone, and occasionally entirely of stone, more or less conical in form, and ranging in size from almost imperceptible elevations to structures of seventy feet in height. They oc-

Mounds and Mound Builders

cur generally throughout the Mound area, and were intended mainly as places of interment and as monuments to the dead. Two striking examples of conical mounds are the Grave Creek Mound in Marshall County, W. Va., and the Miamisburg Mound in Montgomery County, Ohio, each of which is a trifle short of seventy feet in height.

Truncated mounds occur mostly in the lower Mississippi Valley. They are mainly quadrangular flat-topped pyramids, and served as bases or platforms for sacred and domiciliary structures. Surprisingly enough, the greatest of the truncated mounds lies near the northern limit of their occurrence—the great Monks Mound, near East St. Louis, Ill. This tumulus, but one of more than eighty comprising the Cahokia⁸ Group, is 100 feet high and covers sixteen acres of ground.

The Effigy Mounds, so called because they are built in the images of animals, birds and men, and the associated linear mounds, center in southern Wisconsin and adjacent parts of Iowa, Minnesota and Illinois. Within this area are numerous examples, occurring both singly and in groups, particularly in and adjacent to the city of Madison. The greatest of the Effigy Mounds, however, is the Serpent Mound, in Adams County, Ohio. This effigy, following the sinuous coils of the serpent, measures 1330 feet in length. The Effigy Mounds supposedly were adjuncts of the religious observances of their builders.

The defensive earthworks, or fortifications, usually occupy the more or less level tops of isolated hills, and consist of walls of earth and stone following the outer circumferences of such areas, supplementing the natural barriers against intrusion. The walls usually were further fortified by means of pointed upright stakes or pickets. They are of general occurrence, with their greatest development in southern Ohio, where the noted Fort Ancient⁹, in Warren County, is the most striking example.

Geometric enclosures, as contrasted to the defensive works, invariably occur in level valley situations, without consideration of defensive factors, and are strictly adjuncts of the so-called Hopewell¹⁰ culture of southern Ohio and adjacent regions. They usually are low walls of earth, in the form of circles, squares, octagons and parallel walls, occurring singly or in combination. Their function apparently was social and ceremonial, rather than defensive. Examples are the Hopewell, Mound City and Seip groups, in Ross County, Ohio; and the Newark works, at Newark, Ohio.

Shell mounds are accumulations of shells of

both marine and fresh-water mollusks, and are incidental to the use of these as food. They occur to some extent adjacent to inland streams, but mainly along the Atlantic tidewater, particularly in Florida, and often are of great extent. Other major fixed remains of aboriginal occupancy are village-sites, cemeteries and flint quarries, occurring generally throughout the area.

Builders of the ancient Mounds originally were thought to have been a separate and distinct race of people. Archaeological investigations, however, have demonstrated that they were members of the single great race to which the historic Indian, the highly evolved Aztecs, Mayans and Incas of Mexico, Central and South America, and others of the native stocks pertained. While some of the cultures of mound-building peoples cannot be directly identified with historic tribes and nations, it is probable that for the most part they were the ancestors of Indian nations living in the same general area at the time of discovery. It is further probable that the Creeks, Choctaws and Natchez to the southward, the Cherokee and Shawnee in the Ohio Valley, and the Winnebago and some others of the Siouan family²⁹, at some time and to some extent, were builders of mounds. DeSoto³⁰ and other explorers of the 16th century found certain tribes in the South using, if not actually building, mounds. The occasional occurrence of objects of European manufacture as original inclusions in mounds toward the southeast and to the west of the Great Lakes indicates a limited survival of the trait in early Columbian times. However, for unknown reasons, the American tribesmen mostly had lost or abandoned the trait prior to the discovery, and it appears to this writer that some at least of the more important carriers thereof had become extinct as the result of conquest, subjugation, pestilence or some other of the many causes contributing to the decadence of peoples and their cultures.

Since the Mounds and their builders antedate the historic period of America, their age can only be approximated. Peopling of the Americas by Mongoloid immigrants from Asia, subsequent to the most recent glacial invasion (estimated variously at 10,000 to 20,000 years since) presumably led to earlier settlement to the west and south than in the eastern portions of the continent. The main stream of migration appears to have passed southward into Mexico, with an infiltration through the mountain passes across Canada and the Great Plains. To the latter may be attributed many of the nonmound-building Indians, while the settlement of the Mound area seems to have derived from the South and South-

west, at a comparatively late date. The most that can be said of the mound-building stocks is that they were pre-Columbian, but probably not extending backward beyond the beginning of the Christian era.

While the mound-building peoples were still in the Stone Age era, certain of them had achieved a considerable degree of advancement. Copper was hammered into implements and ornaments; very creditable potteryware was made; and woven fabric of several types was produced. In the lower Mississippi Valley and to an even greater extent in the Ohio Valley, a surprising artistic development, in the form of conventional design and small sculptures in the round, probably was not surpassed by any people in a similar stage of development.

[Henry Clyde Shetrone, *The Mound Builders.*]

HENRY C. SHETRONE

Mount Desert, called by the Indians, Pemetic, received its name when the French explored the Maine coast in 1605 and were attracted to the island because of the mountains seen from the sea. Explored by Jesuits³¹ as early as 1611, two years later a small French settlement was made by LaSausseye, only to be laid to waste the same year by Capt. Samuel Argall of the Virginia colony. From then on to the Revolution, the island changed hands frequently, and in 1762 was given outright to Sir Francis Bernard in return for services rendered the crown as governor of Massachusetts.

[G. E. Street, *Mount Desert: A History.*]

ELIZABETH RING

Mount Hope, a hill in the present town of Bristol, R. I., was, in 1676, in the colony of Plymouth³² and the home of the Indian sachem Pomotacom (King Philip), the leading spirit in King Philip's War³³. Pomotacom was slain in a swamp at the west foot of the hill on Aug. 12, 1676. His spring and "stone seat" are on the east side of the hill.

[W. H. Munro, *The History of Bristol, R. I.*]

HOWARD M. CHAPIN

Mount Rushmore National Memorial. See Borglum's Colossal Sculptures.

Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington, is situated on the south bank of the Potomac River, sixteen miles below the city of Washington.

The Washington family acquired title to Mount Vernon by division of a 5000-acre grant in 1690. The central part of the existing house was built about 1743 for Lawrence, elder half-

brother of George Washington. Lawrence died in 1752 and the property passed to George Washington a short time later.

In 1759 Washington married Martha Custis, widow of Daniel Parke Custis, and established his household at Mount Vernon. Here he lived the peaceful life of a Southern planter until the outbreak of the Revolution²⁰. At the close of the war he returned to his home and completed improvements that had been started under his own supervision in 1774 and carried forward by his manager during his absence. Buildings, gardens and grounds were developed substantially to their present form and extent during this period. The mansion and thirteen subsidiary structures have survived. Several others have been reconstructed. Together they constitute one of the best remaining examples of the plantations around which centered the highly developed social and economic life of the South in the 18th century (*see* Plantation System of the South).

Gen. Washington retired from public life at the close of his Presidency in 1797 and again returned to Mount Vernon. Here he died on the 14th of December, 1799; here he was buried. Martha Washington died in 1802 and was interred with him in the family vault.

Mount Vernon has been restored and is maintained by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, an organization founded by Miss Ann Pamela Cunningham of South Carolina. The property was acquired from the last private owner, Col. John Augustine Washington, in 1858. Since that date the work of restoration has progressed steadily.

[Paul Wiltach, *Mount Vernon, Washington's Home and the Nation's Shrine; Diaries of George Washington*, edited by John C. Fitzpatrick.]

CHARLES C. WALL

Mount Washington, Early Exploration of. The first white man to explore Mt. Washington was Darby Field, from coastal New Hampshire. In June, 1642, accompanied by two Indians, he reached its summit; later that summer with a small party of white men he made the ascent again. The White Mountains of which Mt. Washington is the chief eminence were first mentioned in print in John Josselyn's *New England's Rarities Discovered* (1672). In the later colonial period Mt. Washington was occasionally ascended by "ranging parties," as in April, 1725, and in March, 1746. Not until the post-Revolutionary days, however, did any careful exploration occur. In July, 1784, the Rev. Manasseh Cutler and a party which included Dr. Jeremy Belknap climbed the mountain, and gave it the name it now bears. Cutler ascended the peak again in

1804; and in Belknap's third volume of his monumental *History of New Hampshire* (1812) "Mt. Washington" was formally recognized as correct nomenclature.

[Thomas Starr King, *The White Hills*.]

JAMES DUANE SQUIRES

Mountain Meadows Massacre, THE, occurred in southern Utah, in September, 1857. In the summer of that year, two companies of emigrants, one from Arkansas, and the other from Missouri, passed through Salt Lake City on their way to California. In southern Utah, as they reached the country beyond the fringe of settlement, the Missouri company was attacked by the Indians, and was saved by the help of the "Mormon" militia. This company reached the Pacific coast in safety. The Arkansas company met with a terrible fate. It numbered thirty families, aggregating some 137 persons, including a lawless band known as the "Missouri Wild-cats." At a point forty miles from Cedar City, a party of Indians, and a few white men, led by one John D. Lee, a farmer, attacked the company, and all were massacred, except seventeen children, who were spared. It was primarily an Indian outbreak, and was due to the insolent and lawless conduct of certain members of the emigrant party. Gov. Brigham Young had admonished his people to allow all emigrants to pass through the territory unmolested, to furnish them food when necessary, and to protect them from the Indians. John D. Lee was later executed for the crime on the spot where it was committed.

[H. H. Bancroft, *History of Utah*.]

L. E. YOUNG

"Mountain Men," the pioneers of the Rocky Mountain West, came first as fur trappers, lured to the West by beaver as these animals were lured to traps by castor bait. With virgin streams producing the prize catches, there was reward for trail blazing and the trappers thus became the explorers of the Far West. Frenchmen, most experienced of fur gatherers, mingled with Americans and Spaniards at St. Louis in the first decades of the 19th century, and made this the great Western emporium of the fur trade²¹. From here went trapping parties and trading company caravans laden with supplies and Indian goods for the mountain trade. A season or two of trapping and the adventurer boasted the sobriquet of "Mountain Man."

Trapper life had irresistible appeal to a variety of men—to the restless and daring it offered adventure, to the homeless, a home, to the lawless, an asylum. Wedded to the wilds and usually to

the Indian, the "Mountain Man" became a recognizable type, whatever his blood or former home. The mixed racial strains produced a polyglot jargon, spiced with metaphor and figure, and known as "mountain talk." Mingling with the Indian, he adopted the aborigine's manner of life, his food, shelter, morals and frequently his superstitions. He took on the Indian love of adornment, bedecking himself in moccasins and fringed buckskin suit, adorned with dyed porcupine quills or colored glass beads. An Indian buffalo skin lodge provided winter shelter. His rifle, steel traps, skinning knife and horse made him independent and free. Jim Bridger, Kit Carson, Thomas Fitzpatrick and Bill Williams were examples of the fraternity. There were three classes: the hired trapper, paid annual wages by a fur company, the skin trapper, who dealt with one company only; and the free trapper, who trapped and disposed of his furs when and where he pleased.

The summer rendezvous at Green River, Wyo., or other appointed mountain valley, became the most interesting and typical institution of fur trade days. To it white trappers and Indians gathered. Fur companies from Missouri brought out their supplies and trade goods, and barter flourished. With drinking, gambling, racing and contests of skill the "Mountain Man" made holiday. His regular meat diet was now varied by limited supplies of flour, coffee and similar luxuries from "the States." In a few days of prodigal living he frequently spent his year's earnings (*see Trappers' Rendezvous*).

With the introduction of the silk hat and the consequent decline in beaver skin prices, from \$6 or \$8 apiece to \$2 or less, the "Mountain Man" forsook his traps and became a trader with the Indian. Buffalo robes replaced beaver pelts, the trading post supplanted the rendezvous. With the coming of emigrant homeseekers and government exploring and military expeditions, the trapper-trader became scout and guide to lead newcomers over the paths he broke. Advancing civilization "rubbed out" the "Mountain Man."

[E. L. Sabin, *Kit Carson Days*; H. M. Chittenden, *The American Fur Trade of the Far West*.]

LEROY R. HAFEN

Mountain People as a term can be applied only to a portion of the approximately 6,000,000 people dwelling in the Southern Appalachian Highlands. This area, a naturally defined region of some 110,000 square miles reaching through parts of eight Southern states, consists of a great central depression contained between the limits of

the Blue Ridge and Allegheny-Cumberland ranges. In addition the Ozarks, settled by much the same people, present similar conditions.

Composed mainly of English and Scotch-Irish stock, the early settlers were hardly to be distinguished from other pioneer groups moving in search of fertile coves, range for cattle, spring water, and "coverts that might hide deer in slightly valleys." Survivals of Elizabethan English, folklore and ballads⁹⁹ attest to their origins and their isolation. Of the Kentucky mountaineer an official publication of the state's geological survey has said. "The stock is in a large part the same as that of the Blue Grass area but it has been modified by long isolation in an area of lesser opportunity" While the first settlers were largely Presbyterian⁹⁹, a combination of democratic ideas and the ingenious circuit rider⁹⁹ system early transferred their main allegiance to Methodist and Baptist churches⁹⁹.

Outside the Cotton Kingdom⁹⁹, and indifferent if not hostile to both the plantation aristocracy and the Negro slave, the Southern Highlanders opposed secession⁹⁹ and furnished many Union sympathizers as well as deserters from the Confederate Armies. West Virginia went so far as to secede from secession. After the Civil War the mountain people formed the one great block of Republican⁹⁹ voters in the Solid South⁹⁹.

The traits considered most characteristic of mountain life and culture can be regarded as continuations of the frontier tradition and subsistence agriculture. From urban to super-rural, conditions vary greatly in the mountains. In no area, except for the most isolated sections, has the extension of industry, communication, transportation, education and even the tourist trade wrought greater changes. The most pressing problems faced by these people are due to the gradual depletion of timber resources and coal mining, plus the small-scale agriculture based on limited land supply. A high birth rate, lack of educational opportunity and insufficient emigration combine to give certain limited areas the real poverty of overpopulation.

[J. C. Campbell, *The Southern Highlander and His Homeland*; U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Economic and Social Problems and Conditions of the Southern Appalachians*.]

RUPERT B. VANCE

Mourners' Bench, THE, stood at the emotional center of the backwoods religious revival⁹⁹: in the open space between pulpit and audience. It varied from the rude seat of unplanned boards used in remote schoolhouses to a varnished bench in the town churches. Before it knelt the repentant seeking salvation; around it grouped ex-

horters and evangelist to counsel and pray with the contrite.

GENE GEER

Mourt's Relation, printed in London, 1622, a valuable source of information on the Pilgrims' first months in America, was naively propagandist as it described the "safe arival" of these "English Planters" and their "joyfull building of . . . the now well defended Towne of New Plimoth." G. Mourt, signer of the recommendatory preface, is identified as George Morton who settled in Plymouth in 1623. William Bradford and Edward Winslow generally have been considered the chief authors of the book.

["George Morton" and "Edward Winslow" in *Dictionary of American Biography*; H. M. Dexter, ed., *Mourt's Relation*.]

LOUISE B. DUNBAR

Movers (1870-1900). Following the Civil War a great migration into the trans-Missouri region began and continued, with intermittent lulls and temporary retrogressions, into the beginning of the 20th century. A canvas-covered farm wagon carried the belongings of the "mover," consisting of a few articles of furniture, cooking utensils and a scanty supply of farming equipment. Perhaps a plow, spades, a coop of chickens, or a beehive adorned the outside of the overloaded vehicle. Not infrequently the mother drove the team and rode in the wagon while the father and the children drove the loose livestock. The family dog trotted contentedly under the wagon or helped drive the stock. The large amount of food prepared before leaving the old home was supplemented by that prepared around the campfire. The cows were milked and even butter was churned by hanging a can of cream on the jolting wagon. Winter movers built a wooden frame on the wagon and a stove inside kept the occupants cozy. Sometimes the wife drove a buggy, and one or more wagons were driven by the men. Often movers would make two or three such pilgrimages to successive frontiers in a career.

[Everett Dick, *The Sod-House Frontier*.]

EVERETT DICK

Movies. See Motion Pictures.

Mowing Machine, THE. As late as 1840 practically all the hay crop in the United States was still being harvested with the scythe. The reapers offered to the American farmer in the 1830's by Hussey and McCormick could be used as mowers by removing the platform at the rear of the cutter bar upon which the wheat fell. The hay fell behind to be raked up after the machine had passed. The use of the reaper as a mower was, however, unsatisfactory, for such machines

could operate only on comparatively level fields and not on the uneven pastures and uplands where hay was often grown. In 1856, however, Cyrenus Wheeler put on the market a two-wheeled mower with a hinged cutter bar which could operate on rough and uneven ground. By 1860 several machines were manufactured which differ in no essential character from the mowers in use today. The hand rake disappeared along with the scythe. As early as 1812, wooden horse-drawn rakes were in use in the East. The invention of the mowing machine hastened this development. In the Middle West the enclosure of the prairie pastures and the sowing of part of them to cultivated grasses increased enormously the forage crops of that region.

[P. W. Bidwell and J. I. Falconer, *History of American Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860*.]

ERNEST S. OSGOOD

Mrs. O'Leary's Cow (Oct. 8-9, 1871). According to popular legend the great Chicago Fire of 1871 started at Jefferson and DeKoven streets when Mrs. O'Leary went to the stable to visit the family cow and the bovine quadruped inconsiderately upset the lamp she was carrying. No one really knows how the fire started (Mrs. O'Leary herself flatly denied the cow story) but the verdict of *vox populi* is firmly rooted in the public mind.

M. M. QUATRE

Muckrakers, THE. A group of young reformers who, through novel and popular magazine, laid bare the abuses which had crept into American political, social and economic life. The era began in 1903 with the publication of Lincoln Steffens' *The Shame of the Cities* and Ida M. Tarbell's *History of the Standard Oil Company in McClure's Magazine*. These were followed by numerous others, delving into every phase of American life—the most important of which were Ray Stannard Baker's *The Railroads on Trial* (*McClure's*, 1905-6), Thomas W. Lawson's *Frenzied Finance* (*Everybody's*, 1905-6), and David Graham Phillips' *The Treason of the Senate* (*Cosmopolitan*, 1906-7). *Collier's* exposed food adulteration, traffic in women and children, and fraudulent advertising of patent medicines. Of the novelists, the most important was Upton Sinclair who, in *The Jungle* (1906), revealed the unsavory conditions in the packing plants of Chicago. Although the authors were specific in their charges, no major suit was ever entered.

An irresponsible host of sensation mongers was soon attracted and a reaction threatened which would have hindered reform. President Theodore Roosevelt, thoroughly annoyed, in two addresses (March 17 and April 14, 1906), likened

the authors of the exposure literature to the man with the rake in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, who was more interested in the filth on the floor than in a celestial crown, and referred to them as "muckrakers." He declared that the time had come to cease exposure for its own sake and to turn to constructive reform. From then on "muckraking" declined, only to be revived in 1909, when it attached itself to the Progressive Movement⁷⁰. The "muckrakers," primarily responsible for most of the progressive legislation of the period, passed into oblivion after 1912.

[C. C. Regier, *The Era of the Muckrakers*.]

RAYMOND G. WERNER

"Mud March," THE (January, 1863). After his sanguinary repulse at Fredericksburg⁷¹, Burnside (U.) planned to move his army across the Rappahannock and seize positions in rear of Lee's (C.) left flank. Franklin's (U.) two corps, followed by the two under Hooker (U.), marched on Jan. 20 and bivouacked near Banks' Ford. That night a torrential rain began, which continued for days. Pontoon wagons, artillery, trains, in fact the whole army, mired down in the soft clay soil. Lee scarcely needed to move a soldier; the Federal offensive was defeated by the mud. On Jan. 21 Burnside's army returned to Falmouth.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Mugler v. Kansas (123 U. S. 623, 1887). Kansas had passed an act in 1881, under its police power⁷², which forbade the manufacture and sale, except for medicinal purposes, of all intoxicating liquors. Mugler was convicted, under this act, of selling beer. In his defense, it was argued that, since he had invested his money in a brewing business, and had done so with the sanction and under the authority of the state government, he could not be denied the right to continue the operation of his business. To require such discontinuance, it was contended, would be to deprive him of his property without due process⁷³ of law. The Supreme Court refused to accept this position. The decision established the principle that those who choose to engage in a business that is, or which may come to be, regarded as objectionable, have no redress if at some future time the public decides that its discontinuance is desirable. Thus the right of the public to protection takes precedence over the property owning right of the individual.

[Charls K. Burdick, *The Law of the American Constitution*; Ernst Freund, *The Police Power*, Rodney L. Mott, *Due Process of Law*; W. W. Willoughby, *Constitutional Law of the United States*.]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Mugwumps was one of many derisive terms applied to those liberal, or independent, Republicans who bolted the party ticket in the presidential campaign of 1884⁷⁴ to support actively the candidacy of Grover Cleveland and thus were credited with being a strong factor in the defeat of James G. Blaine. They held one national and many regional meetings.

[E. E. Sparks, *National Development*.]

ASA E. MARTIN

Mulattoes appeared on the American scene shortly after the introduction of Negroes⁷⁵ at Jamestown. Because of their blood ties with the whites, their preferment as house servants, and their access to white culture, they had certain advantages over the pure Negroes. This is shown strikingly in the composition of the free Negro class. In 1850 whereas only 7% of the slaves were mulattoes 43% of the free Negroes in the South were mulattoes.

In keeping with the ethnic exclusiveness of the English, mulattoes have always been classed legally and socially as Negroes regardless of the amount of white blood they possessed, but they have tended in some respects to form a class apart from the pure Negroes. Whatever the actual causes may be—whether superior cultural advantages during slavery, the sexual selection of superior parents, the superiority of white blood, or the advantages accruing from the commonly accepted but possibly erroneous belief in such superiority—the fact of superiority of mulattoes in achievement is indisputable. During slavery they produced far more than their share of conspicuous persons and in recent times the ratio of mulattoes to blacks in various listings of prominent and successful Negroes is rarely lower than twenty to one.

[E. B. Reuter, *The Mulatto in the United States*.]

GUY B. JOHNSON

Mulct Law, THE, was a form of local option⁷⁶ adopted in Iowa in 1894. State-wide prohibition, existing since 1884, had met strong opposition in some counties. A compromise resulted by which the prohibitory law was retained, but provision was made for an annual mulct tax of \$600 to be paid by all persons selling intoxicating liquor. The payment of this tax was a bar to prosecution for the sale of liquor in municipalities where a statement of consent had been signed by a majority of the voters. In case a municipality had less than 5000 inhabitants, the signatures of a majority of the voters in the township, and of 65% of the voters in the county outside cities of 5000 or over must be secured. Municipal authorities might add license fees and make additional

regulations. The mulct law was repealed in 1915, and on Jan. 1, 1916, the prohibitory law again became effective throughout Iowa.

[Dan E. Clark, *The History of Liquor Legislation in Iowa*, in *The Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vols. VI, XV.]

RUTH A. GALLAHER

Mule, THE, while introduced into the colonies from Spain, became of significance in America in 1785 with the receipt by Washington of an Andalusian jack and jennets from the King of Spain, and shortly after of a similar Maltese group from Lafayette. By crossing the two breeds Washington secured a mule stock that found ready favor with fellow planters. Another center of origin was in Kentucky where Henry Clay and other leading stockmen imported asses from the two main sources that included the famous jack, "Warrior." The mule proved particularly adapted to plantation^m needs and by 1860 nine tenths were in that region, with the source of supply in the Ohio Valley. Mules were extensively used in the Civil War in the supply trains, and from that time the "army mule" has become proverbial. Mules have been classified according to the main uses to which they have been put, as plantation, heavy draft, mine and farm. Extensive breeding has developed only since the 1880's and has centered in the Southwest. In contrast to the horse the mule demand has remained steady.

[Harvey Riley, *The Mule*; C. S. Plumb, *Types and Breeds of Farm Animals*.]

EARLE D. ROSS

Mule-Skinner (mule driver), bullwhacker (freighter with oxen), cow-puncher^m (rider after range cattle, but originally a man who with a prod-pole punched up cattle that got down in a stock car)—what homely downright terms express occupations peculiar to American soil! Machinery brought words and technicians of a different flavor, as witness chauffeur and air pilot. The mule-skinner and his complement the bullwhacker flourished during the 1850's and through the 1870's, when millions of tons of freight were being pulled by mules and oxen across the Great Plains. In the early 1860's the great firm of Russell, Majors and Waddell^m operated 6250 wagons and 75,000 oxen pulling freight west of the Missouri River. Mules and mule-skinner were at the same time probably as numerous as oxen and bullwhackers. The mule-skinner used a long whip with which he could, aided by "language," take the skin off a mule.

[W. F. Hooker, *The Bullwhacker*; Alexander Majors, *Seventy Years on the Frontier*; Frank A. Root and W. E. Connelley, *The Overland Stage to California*.]

J. FRANK DOBIE

Mullan Trail, THE (1859-62), one of the most important wagon trails of the Pacific Northwest. It was 624 miles long, from the head of navigation of the Missouri River (Fort Benton^m) to Walla Walla. It was built largely for military purposes, but played an important part in opening the Montana mines. Lt. John Mullan directed the building of the trail. Work started at Walla Walla, July 1, 1859, and the trail reached Fort Benton in 1860. Work during the summers of 1861 and 1862 made it a passable pioneer road.

[George W. Fuller, *A History of the Pacific Northwest*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Mulligan Letters, THE, were letters written by James G. Blaine during the years 1864-76 to Warren Fisher, Jr., a businessman of Boston. On May 31, 1876, James Mulligan, an employee of Fisher, testified before a committee of Congress that he had such letters in his possession. On motion of a member of the committee, who pleaded illness, the committee immediately adjourned. That afternoon Blaine obtained possession of the letters, promising to return them. On June 5 he read the letters on the floor of the House and defended himself of the charge that he had used his official power as Speaker of the House^m to promote the fortunes of the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad which it was alleged the letters indicated. Friends of Blaine claimed a complete vindication. Eight years later, however, when he was the Republican candidate for the Presidency, the letters were published and were probably an important factor in his defeat.

[D. S. Muzzey, *James G. Blaine*.]

J. HARLEY NICHOLS

Munfordville, Capture of. Early in the Civil War a Federal earthwork was built on a hill near Munfordville, Ky., to guard the important railroad bridge of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad^m across Green River. When the Confederate Army under Bragg invaded Kentucky in September, 1862, this fort's garrison of about 3600 men held out for nearly three days (Sept. 14-17) against the attacks of a considerable portion of Bragg's force, finally surrendering on the afternoon of the 17th (see Kentucky, Invasion of).

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Municipal Functions, Development of. Municipal governments, being agencies of states, have traditionally been charged with the function of protecting the safety, health and morals of the community. Early interpretation of protection was limited to negative restraints. Modern in-

terpretation includes the concept of positive services. The range of services extends quantitatively from three to three hundred and qualitatively from good to poor. Suffice it to say that when the impact of the Industrial Revolution⁹⁹ reaches a given community, an expansion of municipal functions is imminent. Because this scientific revolution has not reached all cities simultaneously, no uniformity in function is discernible. Nevertheless, certain generalizations may be made.

Safety protection has developed from the colonial watchman-warden system to the permanent public police force inaugurated by New York City in 1844. To the duties of crime apprehension have been added the duties of traffic regulation, building inspection, weights and measures inspection, crime prevention, fire fighting and fire prevention.

Health protection did not receive serious consideration until after the Pasteur discoveries in the last half of the 19th century. Then municipalities took up scientific sanitation, compulsory vaccination, milk inspection, quarantining of communicable diseases, the maintenance of pure water supplies, the recording of vital statistics, abatement of nuisances and hospitalization on a wide scale.

The protection of morals has expanded from mere censorship through the tremendous development of the modern educational system, the founding of public libraries⁹⁹, the establishment of municipal parks, swimming pools, auditoriums, bands, and the like, a new emphasis on correction rather than on punishment for crime, interest in public housing as a moral no less than as an economic problem, and the transfer of relief⁹⁹ from private to public auspices.

Municipal functions, then, have developed in two ways—first by the public appropriation of previously private enterprise, and secondly by the creation of new services. The former is readily illustrated by the gradual transfer from private to public hands of the following activities—street paving, street lighting, water supply, garbage and sewage disposal, transportation facilities, care of orphaned young and indigent old, education, recreation, and finally by the assumption of works projects to expedite employment. The second mode of expansion may be illustrated by the creation of planning and zoning agencies, municipal airports, municipal printing plants and municipal universities⁹⁹. For the most part, municipal functions while increasing quantitatively and qualitatively, are still largely regulative though municipal ownership⁹⁹ and operation are advancing slowly.

[W. B. Munro, *Municipal Administration*; Austin F. MacDonald, *American City Government and Administration*.]

FRANCES L. REINHOLD

Municipal Government, as the term is ordinarily used in the United States, includes primarily the government of cities. Its history in America begins with the chartered boroughs of the colonial era. The government of these boroughs consisted of a mayor, aldermen and councilors, all sitting together. The borough charter emanated from the crown, and the mayor of each borough was usually appointed by the colonial governor⁹⁹, but the councilors and aldermen were chosen, as a rule, by the voters.

As a result of the Revolution many changes were made. Charters now came from the state legislatures. The office of mayor became elective. The suffrage was gradually widened. Following the analogy in the Federal and state governments, the aldermen and councilors were separated into two distinct branches of the municipal legislature and the mayor was given a veto power over their actions. When administrative officers and boards became necessary, the mayor was likewise given the appointing power. Thus the typical city government became, in due course, a reproduction in miniature of the national system.

Under such an arrangement the cities of the United States were almost uniformly governed during the second half of the 19th century. Mayors were elected for short terms (usually one or two years) on partisan ballots. Concurrence of the council's two branches was necessary for the adoption of ordinances or for the taking of any other legislative action. As a rule, all appointments made by the mayor were subject to confirmation by the council's upper branch. The mayor's veto could be overridden by a two-thirds (occasionally a three-fourths) vote of both branches. The city's administrative work (street maintenance, policing, fire protection, etc.) was supervised by appointive boards, usually of three members with provision for bipartisan representation.

Toward the end of the 19th century the cities became restless under this complicated system of checks and balances. Attempts were made to simplify it but without much success until after 1900. Then, in one city after another, the bicameral council was replaced by a single chamber, the requirement of aldermanic confirmation was abolished, the mayor's authority increased and bipartisan boards were replaced by single commissioners. Then these commissioners were placed within the appointing power of the mayor. As this simplification movement made greater

headway in some cities than in others the earlier uniformity in American municipal government gradually disappeared, until today there are scarcely any two cities which have exactly the same political framework.

Meanwhile, moreover, two wholly new plans of municipal government, the commission and city manager plans⁹⁹, completely changed the organization in a large number of cities, particularly in those of small or medium-sized populations. These radical changes were facilitated by the success of the home rule¹⁰⁰ movement, as a result of which the cities in a considerable number of states have been given the right to frame and adopt their own charters within the general provisions of the state laws. Along with the reorganization and simplification of the municipal framework during the past forty years there has also taken place a marked improvement in the procedure by which the business of American cities is conducted. Civil service reform¹⁰¹, better accounting methods, centralized purchasing¹⁰², more intelligible municipal reports, and bureaus of efficiency have all contributed in this direction. Contracts for public work must now be fairly awarded after open competition. Various checks upon wasteful expenditure and needless borrowing have likewise been established, sometimes in the city charters but more often by the provisions of the state laws. Thus the improvements in municipal administration have been in part self-inspired but in part imposed on the cities by the higher authorities. (*See also Local Government.*)

[T. H. Reed, *Municipal Government in the United States.*]

WILLIAM B. MUNRO

Municipal Ownership, in recent years, has been associated mainly with the supply of electric light and power, gas, water, and sometimes with bridges across streams, and transportation. But, among others, modern cities have gone in strongly for ownership and direction of libraries, museums, schools, parks, playgrounds, hospitals and public markets. At present, municipal ownership covers a wide field of service and involves an annual expenditure of millions of dollars and an investment of many times that amount.

In colonial times libraries¹⁰³, which were small affairs, were usually in private hands. It was common practice for one who could afford this luxury to lend books to his friends. The Library of Congress¹⁰⁴ was established in 1800, but the notable growth of such facilities in cities and towns belongs to the period since 1860. Most municipal libraries have been founded and maintained by grants of public funds; but, in notable instances,

these institutions have come into existence by private gift, and many valuable collections are the result of private benefactions and endowment. The municipal library is a development which parallels the growth of public instruction and the enlargement of interest both in fiction and scientific writings. A library is an important part of the equipment of higher grades of schools. In 1934 governmental cost payments for libraries in cities of over 100,000 population amounted to \$20,271,000.

With few exceptions, education¹⁰⁵, in colonial times, was a privilege which only the children of the well-to-do enjoyed. This was provided to boys, and to a limited extent to girls, in the latter case usually through private schools. The years immediately following 1800 did not promise much betterment. In the states created in the West the Federal Government granted one township in each thirty-six for educational purposes, a condition which stimulated materially further demand for popular education. The great expansion of public school systems came chiefly after 1860. This involved a continually expanding need for buildings, grounds and equipment. The number of pupils enrolled increased from 6,800,000 (17.8% of the population) in 1870 to 26,400,000 (20.9% of the population) in 1934. At the latter date the annual expenditure for maintenance of public elementary and secondary schools was \$1,700,000,000. Similar expansion has taken place with other types of municipal social service.

With respect to public utilities¹⁰⁶ in the stricter sense, the attitude toward public ownership during the last hundred years has experienced a number of oscillations. The enthusiasm for public ownership and operation of railroads, turnpikes, canals¹⁰⁷ came to an end with the Panic of 1837. Thereafter, for nearly sixty years, it was believed that public service industries could best be left to private ownership and direction. Various causes have been responsible for the later swing to the public ownership program; among these were the idea that such enterprises are monopolies, the dissatisfaction with the outcome of public regulation¹⁰⁸, and in some cases, as with small communities, the unwillingness of private capital to venture in the business. Although the use of illuminating gas from coal owes its origin mainly to William Murdoch of Redruth, England, in 1792, and subsequently to Bunsen of Bunsen burner fame, its general consumption is of rather recent development. Coal gas was first used in New Orleans about 1834, in Pittsburgh about 1837, in Louisville about 1839 and in Cincinnati in 1843, and at slightly earlier dates in

New York, Boston and Philadelphia. The early development was in the hands of private enterprise. One of the earliest municipal plants was in Philadelphia, established in 1841. On the whole, gas utilities have remained in private hands.

Water supply⁹⁹, on the other hand, has become mainly a municipal enterprise. A considerable number of cities were served with waterworks before 1800. That of Boston was built in 1652, and changed to public ownership in 1848. This shift has been rather common history with many of the establishments which were started as private enterprises. In some cases cities have ventured into ownership and operation of street railways⁹⁹. San Francisco in 1912 is said to have been the first large city that took this step. Detroit entered the business in 1920.

The incipient use of electricity⁹⁹ for light and power was a matter of the decade from 1880 to 1890, and of electric railways⁹⁹ during the following decade. Here, also, the pioneering work was done by private initiative. The number of municipal plants compared with those privately owned makes a rather impressive showing. From 16 in 1885 compared with 151 under private operation, the number increased to 2581 in 1922 compared with 3775 private plants. However, in 1932 the current sold by municipal plants was about 3,748,200 thousand kilowatt hours compared with current sold by commercial establishments of 62,147,600 thousand kilowatt hours. Since 1934 the grant of Federal funds to aid local communities in the establishment of municipal plants has added something to the number of such plants. In the grant of charters to light and power companies various states reserved the right to acquire these plants under one plan or another, but this right seems to have been rather sparingly exercised. Public ownership involves many debatable issues which must await further experience with municipalization before a satisfactory answer can be given.

[Martin G. Glaeser, *Outlines of Public Utility Economics*; Carl D. Thompson, *Public Ownership*.]

ISAAC LIPPINCOTT

Municipal Reform had its beginnings in the United States as a result of the large-scale waste and corruption which was disclosed in the larger American cities during the generation following the Civil War. The operations of the Tweed Ring in New York, the Gas Ring⁹⁹ in Philadelphia and less notorious groups in other cities brought home to the minds of honest citizens some conception of the sordid realities in their municipal system and inspired the earliest organized movements for reform.

But the cause made slow progress for a time because the reform campaigns were undertaken with no more fundamental purpose than that of turning rascals out and electing honest men in their place. From time to time such campaigns proved successful in realizing their immediate purpose, but as a rule very little in the way of permanent advantage resulted from the effort. The new reform administration invariably found itself hamstrung by a system of checks and balances embedded in the city charter. Reformers could not redeem their pre-election promises because although they had the will they lacked the power.

So municipal reform found itself compelled to attack the problem from a new angle. With the beginning of the 20th century it shifted its assaults from the personnel of city governments to the existing complexities of the municipal system. Presently it developed into a nationwide movement for home rule, simplified charters, the abolition of checks and balances, the short, non-partisan ballot, and the city manager plan⁹⁹, as well as for such improvements in the technique of city administration as uniform accounting and centralized purchasing⁹⁹. Having concentrated its efforts upon this more fundamental program, municipal reform has made noteworthy progress during the past generation.

[W. B. Munro, *The Government of American Cities*]

WILLIAM B. MUNRO

Municipal Universities and Colleges resulted from urban growth and democratization of higher education, especially since 1900. Ten cities support fifteen separate institutions (1939). The College of Charleston (1790) came under city control in 1837. The first municipal university, Louisville (1846), combined Louisville Medical Institute (1837) and Louisville College (1838). Its trustees also control Louisville Municipal College for Negroes (1931). The Board of Higher Education of New York City controls the College of the City of New York (1854), Hunter College (1888), Brooklyn College (1930) and Queens College (1937). McMicken University School of Design (1869) became the University of Cincinnati (1873). Toledo University of Arts and Trades (1872) became the University of Toledo (1902). The University of Akron (1913) was originally Buchtel College (1870). Wayne University (Detroit, 1933) combined three municipal colleges: City College (1923), Teachers College (1920), College of Pharmacy (1928); and two originally private institutions: College of Medicine and Surgery (1885) and College of Law (1927). The University of Wichita (1926) was

originally Fairmount Institute (1892). The University of Omaha (1909) was taken over by the city in 1931. The University of Houston and Houston College for Negroes were founded by the school board in 1935. (*See also* Junior College Movement; Teachers Colleges)

[R. H. Eckelberry, *The History of the Municipal University in the United States.*]

W. G. MALLALIEU

Municipalities, State Leagues of. The cities of Iowa, Wisconsin, California, Indiana and Michigan, before 1900, established the first state municipal leagues. Their purpose was to represent the interests of cities before the state legislature. New services, such as ordinance drafting and revision, conferences of city officials, training schools for municipal employees, consultative service on taxation and revenue, city planning⁷⁷, engineering and personnel problems, have made the thirty-five active state leagues invaluable adjuncts of city government. These statewide organizations are federated into the American Municipal Association.

HARVEY WALKER

Munitions. During the American Revolution the Government attempted to meet the problem of providing arms and equipment for the troops by methods of improvisation. It relied for a supply of muskets primarily on the colonists themselves and upon purchase of military equipment in France. Gunsmiths, prior to the war, had flocked to the colonies where weapons were widely used and work was plentiful. It has been estimated that a capacity for manufacturing 100,000 stands of muskets a year existed in the colonies in 1775. This was offset by the fact that, with a large number of local contractors providing muskets, a wide variety of calibers resulted. These calibers ranged from 13 to 30, depending on the number of lead balls to the pound. This greatly complicated the problems of ammunition supply and repair. Gunpowder was manufactured in a number of small mills, but the shortage of powder seriously handicapped the Government in the early stages of the war.

The difficulties experienced in supplying and repairing military equipment during the American Revolution caused Congress in 1794 to direct President Washington to select sites for two national arsenals⁷⁸. He chose Springfield, Mass., and Harpers Ferry, Va. The Board of War and Ordnance, set up by the Continental Congress⁷⁹, gave way in 1812 to the Ordnance Department, formed under Col. Decius Wadsworth to supervise the manufacture and procurement of military weapons and accessories. For some years after the Revolutionary War the standard small arm in the

United States Army was a modified form of the French military musket which was produced in numbers at the Springfield Armory. The difficulties experienced in repairing military muskets in which none of the parts were interchangeable led to an attempt to secure a musket in which all of the parts were interchangeable. In 1800 Eli Whitney, known principally for his invention of the cotton gin⁸⁰, filled a contract for 10,000 muskets which were supposed to be interchangeable⁸¹. Evidently the experiment was not successful or proved to be too costly, for the practice was not continued.

The long duration and relentless character of the Civil War (1861-65) made immense demands for munitions of war. At the beginning, the Ordnance Department had on hand a stock of 530,000 muskets. They were muzzle loaders of Revolutionary War type with the added improvements of rifled barrels and percussion cap firing. Harpers Ferry Armory was destroyed early in the war, limiting production of firearms in government arsenals almost entirely to that of the Springfield Armory. Before the war this arsenal operated at a production rate of 10,000 muskets a year, but this was increased to 200,000 muskets during the second year of the war. Nearly a year was required for private contractors to convert their facilities to the manufacture of muskets on a large scale. During the second year of the war private contractors assisted in raising the total number of rifles⁸² produced in the North to 700,000. Although a total of 726,705 muskets was purchased abroad, only 165,000 of this number were actually serviceable, and the introduction of foreign muskets into the Union service again complicated the ammunition supply and repair problems.

The Civil War was primarily a struggle between infantry, and since the Government did not change the design of its musket after the war began, the problem of manufacturing muskets was comparatively simple. The private contractors were not hindered by a large number of changes in design as was the case during the World War. The requirements for cannon and heavy ordnance⁸³ were relatively small and the designs did not change. Only 7892 cannon were issued to the Union armies as against 4,022,130 muskets. Ninety million pounds of lead bullets were issued to the troops as compared to 13,000,000 pounds of artillery projectiles. The manufacture of powder and lead bullets for the Union armies met all requirements, and the Ordnance Department finished the war with a very large reserve of both commodities in its depots. (*See also* Civil War Munitions.)

Up to the period of the World War, it was the

policy of the United States Government to rely for a supply of munitions of war upon its own armories which developed and tested military weapons, and upon the facilities of private contractors, and on foreign purchase. The lessons of Civil and Spanish-American wars made it clear that at least one year was required for the conversion of private manufacturing facilities to war production on a large scale, that a standard caliber for small arms was essential, and that ordnance matériel of great immediate military value could seldom be acquired by foreign purchase. By the time of the Spanish-American War the Government had five principal arsenals: Springfield, Frankford, Watervliet, Watertown and Rock Island.

With the development of long-range breech-loading artillery, the manufacturing difficulties in the production of heavy ordnance matériel greatly increased. The special character of the steel required, and the many technical difficulties in the process of manufacture, limited the production of this type of equipment prior to 1917 to the government arsenals and to two private plants, the Bethlehem Steel Company and the Midvale Steel Company.

In 1903 an important step toward the simplification of munitions manufacture was taken when the U. S. Rifle Caliber .30, Model 1903, was adopted as the standard weapon for all military and naval forces. This weapon was produced at the Springfield Armory, and was familiarly called the "Springfield rifle." When it was decided to equip the Rock Island Arsenal for the manufacture of this rifle, steps were taken to insure the interchangeability of some of its parts.

With the introduction of standardized methods of manufacture, the production of munitions entered the modern phase of its development. Complete interchangeability of all parts of military equipment had long been the dream of soldiers charged with the supply and repair of military equipment in the field. American commercial practices prior to 1917 were more adaptable to such a program than those of most European states. There had been a definite trend toward standardization of threads, gauges and taps during the period before the war. American manufacturers enjoyed the use of standard reamers, standard screw threads and standard involute gear cutters long before any other country. There was some use of go-gauges in American plants prior to the war, but very little use of no-go-gauges which are equally essential to the maintenance of close tolerances. Given the necessary gauges, dies, equipment and skilled personnel, the manufacture of war equipment on an inter-

changeable basis was possible at a much more rapid rate than heretofore.

When the United States entered the World War in 1917, many of its private contractors had been manufacturing munitions of war for the Allied countries for a period of two years. These contractors had been able to supply a very large quantity of small articles of war to the Allies, but fell down notably on the production of heavy military equipment.

The manufacturing problems of the War Department were complicated in 1917 by the fact that manufacturing facilities engaged on Allied contracts were not to be disturbed by the Ordnance Department; by the fact that the United States Navy had priority rights on all matériel it required; and by the fact that new facilities had to be created for most of the heavy ordnance program. Delays were encountered because of the adoption of French artillery matériel which the Ordnance Department attempted to produce in the United States on an interchangeable basis. The French had never manufactured this matériel on such a basis, and their blueprints were found to be full of baffling errors and their screws and threads were unknown in the United States. Frequent changes in designs of military equipment as the result of requests from the A. E. F. also added to the confusion of inexperienced manufacturers.

An attempt was made to speed up the American munitions program in 1917 by dividing ordnance matériel into its various components and having one contractor specialize on the production of a single component. Although this was intended to increase production, it actually restricted production of total useful weapons in many instances. There was no agency powerful enough to balance the manufacturing flow of the various components. As a result there was immense production of components easy to manufacture and a very limited production of difficult components. The total of complete units was limited by the component produced in the smallest number. As an example, hundreds of barrels for the 75mm. field gun model 1897 were produced, hundreds of gun carriages were built, but only one recuperator was completed up to Nov. 11, 1918. This limited the number of 75mm. field guns of this model actually produced in the United States to one gun.

In the production of small arms, machine guns²⁷ and small arms ammunition the production of the United States in 1917-18 was very high and always met the combat requirements of American troops. In the production of airplanes, tanks, artillery²⁸ and artillery ammunition, the

results were disappointing but not surprising to those who were aware of the difficulties involved in the manufacture of this equipment. At the end of from eighteen to twenty-four months, the United States had converted its manufacturing facilities to war production on such a large scale that had the war continued after November, 1918, American military equipment would have been available on a colossal scale.

With the increased mechanical character of modern warfare, the production of munitions has become one of the vital problems of a modern state. The requirements of a modern army are enormous. Whereas the German armies in 1870-71 expended a total of 817,000 artillery projectiles in the war with France, the French army alone, in the year 1918, expended a total of 81,070,000 rounds of artillery ammunition. Not only has the demand for individual items of war equipment increased with the vast armies of the present, but the variety of military equipment has also been multiplied. In 1917-18 the War Department produced 100,000 different items of military equipment.

The experience of the United States Government in the production of munitions during the World War made it clear that the efficiency of manufacture and procurement of war equipment required centralized control and decentralized operation; that the competition of semi-independent supply bureaus for the same manufacturing facilities could not be tolerated; that effective mobilization of industry for war purposes could best be brought about by a nonmilitary organization; and that time required to achieve munitions production on a large scale could be reduced by careful planning and full utilization of all economic resources for war purposes (see Mobilization).

[*Annual Reports of the Chief of Ordnance*; B. Crowell, *America's Munitions, 1917-1918*; B. Crowell and R. Wilson, *The Armies of Industry, Our Nation's Manufacture of Munitions for a World at War*; W. Crozier, *Ordnance in the World War*.]

H. A. DEWEERD

Munitions Board. See War Industries Board.

Munn v. Illinois (1877), one of the Granger cases^u, involved the validity of an Illinois law of 1871 that fixed maximum rates for the storage of grain. A Chicago warehouse firm, Munn and Scott, found guilty in 1872 of violating the law, appealed first to the state supreme court, where the decision of the lower court was affirmed, and then to the United States Supreme Court, which upheld the Illinois statute. To the argument that the fixing of maximum rates constituted a taking of property without due process^u of law, the

Court replied that the warehouse business was sufficiently clothed with a public interest^u to justify public control; and to the argument that Congress alone had the right to regulate interstate commerce^u, of which the storage of grain was a part, the Court replied that until Congress made use of its power a state might act, "even though in so doing it may indirectly operate upon commerce outside its jurisdiction." (See *Wabash, St. Louis and Pacific Railroad v. Illinois*)

[94 *United States Reports*, 113; S. J. Buck, *The Granger Movement*.]

JOHN D. HICKS

Murchison Letter. See Sackville-West Incident.

Murdering Town, probably an Indian encampment, was located on Connoquenessing Creek, Butler County, Pa. Both Washington and Gist^u mention, in their diaries, passing the place Dec. 27, 1753, on their return from Fort LeBoeuf^u. Some miles farther on an Indian from the place fired on Gist. Gist named it Murthering town.

[W. M. Darlington, ed., *Christopher Gist Journals*; J. C. Fitzpatrick, *The Diaries of George Washington*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Murfreesboro, Battle of (Dec. 31, 1862-Jan. 2, 1863). After Perryville^u, Gen. Braxton Bragg withdrew his Confederates through eastern Tennessee. The Union Army of the Cumberland^u under Rosecrans concentrated at Nashville. Both forces were reorganized and refitted during November and December, Bragg facing and annoying Rosecrans from Murfreesboro thirty miles away. After a five-day deployed advance Rosecrans confronted Bragg drawn up astride Stone River protecting Murfreesboro. Each general aimed against his enemy's right on Dec. 31. Bragg, striking first against the flank and rear of McCook's (U) unready corps, would have won save for inspired resistance by Sheridan's division and stern pertinacity by Thomas' (central) corps. Rosecrans' attack lagged. He recalled Crittenden's advancing (left) corps and hurried reinforcements to the Union right, bent back, repeatedly charged, dented, but not broken. By nightfall the two nearly equal armies had fought themselves into fatigue, with ground, spoils and many prisoners in Confederate hands, and Rosecrans' Unionists clinging desperately to the Nashville pike and pinned against the river. For a full day the forces took breath as sporadic Confederate advances were checked. Instead of withdrawing his shaken army, Rosecrans was awaiting ammunition and moving one of Crittenden's divisions back across the river. January 2, Bragg sent nearly 10,000 men against Crittenden's di-

vision and broke it, but an insane counterattack made without orders by 1500 Indianians across the stream cracked the assault; sudden artillery concentration shattered it; and the battle stopped. Next day Bragg's nerve broke and that night he retreated toward Chattanooga²⁷.

[H. M. Cist, *Army of the Cumberland*; W. J. Vance, *Stone's River*; D. C. Seitz, *Braxton Bragg*.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Muscle Shoals Project. See Tennessee Valley Authority.

Muscle Shoals Speculation, THE (1783-89), is significant mainly as a spectacular, but characteristic, phenomenon of American frontier life in the period of the Confederation²⁸. The Muscle Shoals region on the Tennessee River was then thought to have great potential value for the commerce of the Westerners, since it might afford them an outlet via Mobile at a time when Spain denied them the use of the Mississippi River (see Mississippi River, Free Navigation of). The project for establishing a colony at Muscle Shoals passed through three phases, in all three of which it was resisted by many of the neighboring Indians, who were supported by Spain. The Confederation, too, opposed it, but less effectively. In the first phase, 1783-85, it was a private enterprise organized by six North Carolinians (John Sevier and two other frontiersmen, and William Blount and two other Easterners), who, under a purchase from some Indians and a grant from Georgia, planned to colonize the Muscle Shoals region as a colony of that state. In the second phase, 1785-86, the project was made a part of the expansionist program of the new State of Franklin²⁹, of which Sevier was governor, and it contemplated co-operation with Georgia in a war of conquest against the neighboring Indians. When these plans went awry, the project entered on its third phase, 1786-89, which was marked by an intrigue with Spain (see Spanish Conspiracy), the Franklinites offering to secede from the Union in return for Spanish support of their project. Spain rejected the proposal, Sevier became a loyal supporter of the new Federal Government, and the project again became a private enterprise. In the 1790's it was actively prosecuted by Blount, Zachariah Cox and others; but the opposition of the United States Government, the Indians and Spain prevented its execution.

[A. P. Whitaker, *The Spanish American Frontier*.]

A. P. WHITAKER

Museums. The nuclei of some very early museums in America were private "cabinets" of men interested in science, containing geological and

botanical specimens, mounted birds and animals. A Mr. Arnold of Norwalk, Conn., had a notable one before the Revolution. Perhaps the oldest existing as well as the first public museum is that of Charleston, S. C., founded by the Charles Town Library Society in 1773. Charles Willson Peale and his son Rembrandt established a renowned museum in Philadelphia in 1785 in which painted backgrounds, as well as nests and eggs, were arranged with the mounted birds, thus foreshadowing the modern elaborate habitat groups. The East India Marine Society founded a museum at Salem, Mass., in 1799, which grew into the still existent Peabody Museum. That of the Academy of Natural Science at Philadelphia, founded 1812, and of the Linnean Society of Boston (1814), merged in the Boston Society of Natural History in 1831, are two more of the older ones. The private collection of the scientist Agassiz, after his death in 1873 became the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Cambridge. From various exploring expeditions the National Government was already accumulating a cabinet when the Smithsonian Institution³⁰ was organized in 1846, and this passed into its custody, becoming the United States National Museum in 1876. The American Museum of Natural History in New York, one of the greatest of its kind, was begun in 1869. The Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago was founded in 1894 by Marshall Field, who bestowed \$9,000,000 on it. There are other great endowed scientific collections. States, universities and colleges also began building up museums of their own in the 19th century, and there are now hundreds of these. The Buffalo Academy of Science seems to have been the first to promote lecturing, this in 1872. During that century also there grew up special types of museums, such as aquariums, zoological and botanical collections—for example, the Arnold Arboretum in Boston, founded in 1872. Museums of transportation, of business, industry, education, costume, surgery, etc., were among the many new conceptions which came later. Scudder's Museum, opened in New York in 1810, was perhaps the first to exhibit natural curiosities for profit. P. T. Barnum's ownership of it (see Barnum's Museum) developed the idea of the myriads of dime museums which flourished in most cities between 1870 and 1910. Deformities and monstrosities, giants, midgets, strong men, snake charmers, bogus mermaids and "wild men" were among their common exhibits.

Museums of art came more slowly than those of science. The earliest, that of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, was opened in 1805. The Boston Atheneum, founded 1807, built up an art

gallery which became the Museum of Fine Arts in 1870. The Corcoran Art Gallery, a private collection presented to the City of Washington in 1869, was opened in 1874. The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, the largest in America, was incorporated in 1870. Those post-bellum years were remarkable for the upbuilding of museums. Pittsburgh, Chicago, Cincinnati, St. Louis, San Francisco and other cities installed fine art collections⁹⁷ before the end of the century. The great museum of the New York Historical Society (founded 1804) presents another type, that of history, of which hundreds, owned for the most part by state, county or city historical societies, came into being, especially after 1900, when America began to take a greater interest in its past. In this class are the numerous historic public buildings, residences and churches endowed or publicly maintained as museums—such as Mount Vernon, Independence Hall and the Old South Church⁹⁸ in Boston. A group of buildings on one block in New York houses a curious assortment of highly specialized museums—that of the Hispanic Society of America, founded 1904, of the American Numismatic Society (1908), of the American Indian (Heye Foundation) opened 1922, and others.

[Frederic A. Lucas, *Glimpses of Early Museums*; W. H. Widgery, *The History of Educational Museums*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Music. The history of music in America divides itself chronologically into four periods. In the first, from 1600 to 1800, New England puritanism forbade any form of music except Psalmody and little improvement could be achieved in this restricted field since the profession of music as a trade was forbidden by law. In Virginia, the spirit of the Cavaliers admitting greater freedom, secular songs remembered from England were in frequent use and a few instruments privately owned. By 1720 the first influx of professional musicians and instrument makers from overseas, the printing of "tunebooks" and the opening of singing schools⁹⁹ had brought about a definite improvement in musical standards. The German and Moravian settlers of Pennsylvania and the New Amsterdam Dutch were far in advance of the New Englanders, but the first public concert on these shores took place in Boston (1731), and the first native American composer on record was Francis Hopkinson.

The second period, 1800–1860, opened with the performance of Handel's "Messiah" by the University of Pennsylvania (1801) when for a time the leadership in musical affairs passed to that state, not only Philadelphia but Bethlehem attaining high eminence which persists to this

day when visitors from all over the country flock to Bethlehem's yearly Bach Festivals. The opening of the Leipsig Conservatory in Germany (1843) quickly attracted American students anxious for thorough musical training, thus starting a tradition of foreign study which has obtained until very recently. On the other hand the European political upheavals (1848) brought over a new type of immigration (*see* Forty-Eighters) and there followed a quick increase in cultural appreciation, mounting efforts at musical organization and a rapid expansion of the piano trade. Among the outstanding musical organizations founded at this time are the Handel and Haydn Society of Boston (1815), the New York Philharmonic (1824) and the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia (1820). From 1801 on, French Opera was heard regularly in New Orleans and in 1825 Manuel Garcia launched an operatic season in New York, since when this city has never been without some sort of annual grand opera season. Both private teachers of music and conservatories were now flourishing and by 1850 the University of Virginia, Yale College and Oberlin College had regularly appointed professors of music. The names of Lowell Mason (1792–1872) and of Theodore Thomas (1835–1905) emerge as sturdy musical pioneers, the latter eventually founding the Theodore Thomas Orchestra of Chicago (1890). Stephen Collins Foster (1826–64) appears at this time as a writer of popular songs so deeply rooted in popular tradition as to have become part of our folk-song¹⁰⁰ heritage which, boasting elements from England, Spain, Ireland, Scotland, as well as North American tribal melodies and the Afro-American Spirituals, is an unusually rich one. This last is perhaps our greatest contribution to the world's music to date.

The period 1860–1900 was characterized by a rapid acceleration in the spread of musical culture due to the American tours of the world's greatest virtuosi. Under Leopold Damrosch the Metropolitan introduced Wagnerian opera to this country (1884), and American singers and instrumentalists began to successfully invade European concert halls. A handful of talented German-trained American composers distinguished themselves, but until Edward MacDowell (1861–1908) no American composer was acclaimed by European critics.

The present century was characterized at first by a trend away from the German influence and toward the new musical Impressionism of the French school headed by Debussy. A fairly large group of interesting composers began to receive attention and performances by leading orchestras

and opera companies in Europe as well as at home, but since 1925 there has been a growing feeling that truly American music should spring from native sources of thought and feeling and the arrival of many of Europe's most prominent teachers obviated the necessity for foreign training. Musical foundations and scholarships have multiplied in the last decade, and the present period is one of great activity if not of profundity.

[Grove's *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, American Supplement; O. G. Sonneck, *Early Concert Life in America*; John Tasker Howard, *Our American Music*; Theodore Stearns, *The Story of Music*]

MARGUERITE LAMAR STEARNS

Muskingum River Canal Route. The canal in Ohio connecting Cleveland on Lake Erie with Portsmouth on the Ohio River was completed in 1832 (see Ohio State Canals). As a supplement to this canal a project was authorized in 1836 to canalize the Muskingum River and join it with the canal at Dresden Junction. It was finished in 1841. The chief benefit was steam navigation from Marietta on the Ohio up the river to Zanesville in 1841.

[C. P. McClelland and C. C. Huntington, *History of Ohio Canals*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Mustangs. "After God, we owed the victory to the horses." Thus Bernal Diaz, the great chronicler of the Conquest of Mexico. When Cortés landed, 1519, he had sixteen horses and a colt born on the ship that brought them—all mares and stallions, no geldings. In time the Spaniards brought other horses (see Horse, The Spanish, in North America). They explored the New World on horseback. They raised horses on unfenced ranges. For twenty-four years after the landing of Cortés a royal edict prohibited an Indian's riding a horse. But horse stock strayed from the *haciendas*; on explorations that took their riders thousands of miles into the unknown, horses were lost. The wild increase of these lost and estrayed animals were called *mesteños*—mustangs. Indians learned to master what, "next to God," had mastered them.

By 1600 savage bands mounted on horses were roaming along the Rio Grande; seventy-five years later the Pawnees[™] and other tribes of the plains had come to regard horses as a necessity of life; before 1750 Indians in central Canada were using them. Radically revolutionizing the ways of life of the Plains Indians, the horse ushered in for them what history calls "the Age of Horse Culture." The horse became their symbol of wealth and power. In 1823 a single band of Comanches[™] on Red River claimed to own 16,000 horses.

On the plains of Alberta, down the great corridor between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains, and along the length of the Mesa Central of Mexico, wild horses, the mustangs, ran with the deer, the antelopes and the buffalo. No estimate of the numbers is possible. In 1846 Lt. U. S. Grant saw in Texas between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande so many mustangs that he doubted "if the State of Rhode Island" could hold them. On old maps this region is marked "Mustang Desert." On the Staked Plains[™] the wild horses were hardly less numerous.

They ran in bands, called *manadas*, each under the leadership of a stallion, who fought other stallions off and managed his mares like a general. Like the longhorns[™], the mustangs were of many colors. Some stallions gained wide fame, the Pacing White Mustang becoming one of the legends of America. Early in the 19th century mustanging began to develop into one of the occupations of the Southwest. Mustangers used various methods to capture the wild horses, sometimes "walking them down," keeping after a single band until it was utterly exhausted from lack of sleep, food and water; trapping them in pens; snaring them singly along trails, "creasing" them—shooting so that the bullet grazed a cord along the top of the neck, thus stunning but not permanently injuring the animal; often catching colts and raising them by hand.

The ranches and missions of early California raised tens of thousands of Spanish horses that were mustangs, many of which were stolen by Indians and herds of which were "lifted" by Mountain Men[™] and driven east. Synchronous with the great cattle drives[™] from Texas, at least a million horses of the mustang breed were driven north.

With the development of ranching, mustangs were recognized as a nuisance and were killed out. The wild horses ranging today in certain places of Arizona, Wyoming and other Western states are not of the unmixed Spanish mustang breed. This wonderfully hardy breed is not being preserved in North America as its counterpart, the *criollo*, is being preserved in South America. The wild horses along the Carolina seaboard were another breed. The mustang—even though Mark Twain satirized "A Genuine Mexican Plug"—influenced tremendously the history of the West.

[J. Frank Dobie, *Tales of the Mustang*; R. B. Cunningham-Graham, *The Horse of the Conquest*; James K. Greer, *Bois d'Arc to Barb'd Wire*; Clark Wissler, *The Influence of the Horse in the Development of Plains Culture*, *American Anthropologist*, Vol. XVI.]

J. FRANK DOBIE

Muster Day. Under the militia act of 1792, in effect for more than a century, every able-bodied citizen between the ages of eighteen and forty-five was a member of the militia^m. Actual enrollment was accomplished through the annual muster day, which soon degenerated into an annual spree. After the Civil War muster day was generally neglected.

[A. B. Longstreet, *Georgia Scenes*; Reuben Davis, *Recollections of Mississippi and Mississippians*.]

DON RUSSELL

Mutiny. An examination of various military authorities leads to a welter of contradiction in defining this term. From actual conditions a working definition may be evolved and stated as "Concerted insubordination, or concerted opposition or resistance to or defiance of lawful military authority, by two or more persons subject to such authority, with the intent to usurp, subvert or override such authority, or to neutralize it for the time being." When examples of mutiny are sought, difficulty is encountered in that the larger number of cases that might possibly be so designated are tried for lesser charges, insubordination, refusal to obey orders, etc. This gives rise to many borderline cases. However, our history affords some definite examples, the most striking that of the entire Pennsylvania Line, six regiments, which mutinied at Morristown on Jan. 2, 1781, and started for Philadelphia to lay their grievances directly before Congress (*see Pennsylvania Troops, Mutinies of*).

A year before, on May 25, 1780, two regiments of the Connecticut Line paraded without their officers in a spirit of mutiny. They were brought back under authority by a Pennsylvania brigade. On Jan. 20, 1781, three New Jersey regiments sought to imitate the Pennsylvania Line. Washington ordered Gen. Robert Howe to handle the situation. He surrounded the mutineers with infantry and artillery at Ringwood and gave them five minutes to come to time. They yielded; the ringleaders were immediately tried and two of them hung, whereupon the regiments returned to duty. In June, 1783, recruits of the Pennsylvania regiments marched upon Congress at Philadelphia. When Congress fled to Princeton, Gen. Howe again stepped in and settled matters.

In the War of 1812, the 23d Infantry mutinied at Manlius, N. Y.; the 5th Infantry at Utica; a company of volunteers at Buffalo and, in 1814, Col. Pipkin's regiment of Tennessee militia, part of Gen. Jackson's forces, had a sergeant and five privates condemned to death for inciting mutiny.

A conspicuous maritime case was that on the United States brig *Somers*^m in 1842 when Mid-

shipman Spencer (son of the then Secretary of War) was one of three prisoners hung on ship-board as a mutineer.

[James Thacher, *Military Journal during the American Revolution*; Oliver L. Spaulding, *The United States Army in War and Peace*; William Winthrop, *Military Law and Precedents*; Stephen V. Benét, *A Treatise on Military Law and the Practice of Courts-Martial*; William Hough, *Precedents in Military Law*; George B. Davis, *A Treatise on the Military Laws of the United States*, John H. Morgan, *Notes on Military Law*; *A Manual for Courts-Martial—United States Army*.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Mutiny Act of 1765, THE, was a routine Parliamentary enactment. The feature affecting the American colonies was the quartering provision which, like the Stamp Act^m, was designed to shift the burden of supporting British troops in America from British taxpayers to the colonists by requiring provincial legislatures to provide barracks, fuel and certain other necessities for the soldiers stationed within their borders. Colonial Whigs feared that the Mutiny Act was designed to pave the way for the introduction of a standing army to enforce the Stamp Act; but after the repeal of the Stamp Act, the cry was raised in the colonies that the Mutiny Act violated the principle of no taxation without representation^m. Most of the colonies attempted to evade the act; and New York refused point-blank in 1767 to obey it. To punish the colony, Parliament passed an act suspending the New York legislature on Oct. 1, 1767, but the New York assembly had already grudgingly provided for the troops. Thus the Mutiny Act served to keep alive the controversy over taxation without representation during the interval between the repeal of the Stamp Act and the passage of the Townshend duties^m. (*See also* Billeting)

[C. H. Van Tyne, *The Causes of the War of Independence*.]

JOHN C. MILLER

"My Country, 'Tis of Thee." In 1832 Lowell Mason, musical educator and hymn writer of Boston, handed Samuel F. Smith—then a theological student at Andover and becoming known as an amateur poet—a book of German songs, asking him to look over it and if he found any good tunes, to make an English translation of the words thereto, or write original songs to the meter, for use in schools. One air, simple yet strong and pleasing, gave Smith a patriotic inspiration, and within half an hour he had written five stanzas of the now familiar hymn to his native land, "My Country, 'Tis of Thee." The third stanza he later discarded, and the remaining four stand almost as originally written. Not until some time afterward did Smith learn that

the tune he had used was that of the British national anthem, "God Save the King," which had been taken over into the musical literature of several other lands. Even the melody is of gradual growth, though in its present form it is generally attributed to the early 18th century English composer, Henry Carey. Smith's hymn was first sung in the Park Street Church, in Boston, July 4, 1832. Anti-British feeling was still strong in the United States then, but strangely enough, the knowledge that the air was that of the British national anthem did not deter the growth of the song's popularity. It was first published in Mason's collection, *The Choir*, in 1832. With the tune rechristened "America," and without any official action, the song—simple, melodious, easily sung and remembered—became within two or three decades as nearly a national anthem as anything we have—perhaps even nearer than "The Star-Spangled Banner"⁹⁰, which is essentially a pæan to the national flag, and is frequently under attack because of its alleged unsuitability.

[Samuel F. Smith, *Poems of Home and Country*.]
ALVIN F. HARLOW

"My Old Kentucky Home" (1853) is perhaps the finest work of our greatest composer of folk-songs⁹¹, Stephen Foster. Though its origin is shrouded in legend, it seems probable that the original inspiration came from a visit that Foster made to Federal Hill at Bardstown, Ky., sometime in the 1840's. This old Southern mansion was the home of Judge John Rowan, a relative of Foster's.

The song has become a part of our history because, in words and music of singular beauty, it perpetuates the romantic tradition associated with Kentucky and the ante-bellum South. It throws an aura of rose-tinted romance over the culture of the old South and over the institution that made possible that culture. In this song slavery is a benevolent institution, enriching the life of both the master and the slave. It is the note of sentiment which Foster struck here, as well as the quality of the music, that has made "My Old Kentucky Home" a classic of American literature and of American music. The picture it presents of a culture that has passed from our national life (see Plantation System of the South) is one that has a universal appeal, not only because it was doomed but because it was in itself a gracious thing, despite its darker aspect.

[John T. Howard, *Stephen Foster, America's Troubadour*.]
E. H. O'NEILL

Myer, Fort. Situated on Arlington Heights on the west shore of the Potomac River, this fort,

originally designated Fort Whipple, was built in 1863 as part of the defenses of Washington. In 1881 it was redesignated Fort Myer and in 1887 it was made a cavalry post, and is annually the scene of riding exhibitions and pageants, attended by official and social Washington. The Chief of Staff of the Army, while not an officer of the post, usually resides in quarters there.

[*Outline Description of Military Posts and Reservations in the United States and Alaska and of National Cemeteries*, prepared in the Quartermaster General's Office, War Department.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Myers v. U. S. The Constitution definitely confers upon the President a broad power to appoint Federal officers "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," but is silent upon the President's right to remove officers so appointed. Since 1789, however, Presidents have assumed that their power to appoint and their duty to see that the laws are faithfully executed implied the power to remove without senatorial consent, even though Senate approval may have been necessary for the original appointment. In 1876 Congress restricted the power of removal by requiring senatorial approval for removals of postmasters. In 1920 President Wilson, without consulting the Senate, removed Frank S. Myers, postmaster at Portland, Oregon, who brought action to test the legality of the President's action. The Supreme Court, by a vote of six to three (1926), upheld the removal, declaring that the act of 1876 was an unconstitutional invasion of executive authority, and giving the Court's sanction to the executive assumption stated above. Incidentally, the Tenure-of-Office Act of 1867⁹²—partly repealed in 1869 and wholly in 1887—was pronounced to have been unconstitutional, thus supporting the contention of President Johnson at the time the act was passed over his veto. The broad doctrine that Congress may not limit the President's power of removal⁹³ has, however, been somewhat narrowed by the Court's decision (1935) in the case of W. E. Humphrey's⁹⁴ removal from the Federal Trade Commission.

[*Myers v. United States*, 272 U. S. 52, 1926; E. S. Corwin, *The President's Removal Power under the Constitution*; H. L. McBain, *Consequences of the President's Unlimited Power of Removal*, *Pol. Sci. Quar.*, December, 1926, W. J. Donovan and R. R. Irvine, *The President's Power to Remove Members of Administrative Agencies*, *Cornell Law Quar.*, February, 1936.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Nacogdoches is the oldest town in eastern Texas. Under Spain, it was a strategic frontier outpost until the disturbances of the Mexican war for independence almost destroyed it. Un-

der Mexico, it became a gateway for Anglo-American immigrants, a center of some revolutionary disturbances, notably the Fredonian Revolt⁹⁰, and the capital of a political subdivision of Texas. Its inhabitants took a leading part in the Texas Revolution and in the affairs of the Republic of Texas⁹¹.

[George L. Crockett, *Two Centuries in East Texas*; George P. Garrison, *Texas: A Contest of Civilizations*.]

C. T. NEU

Nails, Tax on (1789). The first session of the Federal Congress levied an import duty of one cent per pound on "nails and spikes" but not on tacks and brads. Several Southern members of Congress opposed this duty, but finally agreed to a small tax to protect this industry which engaged farmers' families through the long winter evenings.

[Richard Hildreth, *History of the United States*.]

CHARLES MARION THOMAS

Nantucket, an island south of Cape Cod, Mass., was settled by the English in 1659. Sterile soil directed the attention of settlers to the capture of whales off-shore. Eventually, deep-sea vessels of thirty tons burthen were fitted out for cruises of six months' duration. After the American Revolution new boats were built, and in 1791 its vessels rounded Cape Horn and thereafter ventured down the equator to the coast of Asia. The spread of whaleships (*see* Whaling) into the uncharted Pacific opened an era of discovery and trade, and the expansion of American diplomacy into South American, Polynesian and Oriental lands which may be attributed in measure to Nantucket enterprise and hardihood. A fleet of six sloops in 1715 had grown to a marine of eighty-six large and four smaller vessels by 1842. Voyages of four or six years were common occurrences. A waterfront fire, the California "gold rush," and the discovery of petroleum were factors which contributed to the downfall of Nantucket whaling, always handicapped by an inadequate harbor. In 1869 the last whaleship cleared port, and brought to a close a brilliant chapter in American economic history.

[Alexander Starbuck, *The History of Nantucket*.]

LLOYD C. M. HARE

Naples, American Claims on (1809-42), arose from seizures of American vessels and cargoes ordered by Murat, Napoleon's brother-in-law, as king of the Two Sicilies. William Pinkney, United States minister to Russia, attempted negotiations in 1816, but the Bourbon government denied responsibility for acts of the usurper. A fresh effort by special agent John J. Appleton in 1825-26 yielded like results, although it estab-

lished the amount of actual losses. The French spoliation⁹² treaty of 1831 which ended the legitimist pretensions of irresponsibility, the visit of an American squadron, and the lure of a commercial treaty helped John Nelson, chargé d'affaires, to reach an agreement in 1832. Ten years later the last payment was made, the total being \$2,049,033¹².

[Hunter Miller, ed., *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America*; P. C. Perrotta, *The Claims of the United States against the Kingdom of Naples*.]

HENRY M. WRISTON

Napoleon's Decrees. Throughout his long struggle with Great Britain, Napoleon was torn between the desirability of excluding British commerce and the undesirability of economic suffocation for Continental Europe. His policy alternated between impositions such as the Berlin, Milan and supplementary decrees, and a system of licenses accorded from time to time as exceptions to the major decrees.

To particularize, the Berlin Decree of Nov. 21, 1806, in belated response to the Orders in Council⁹³ of May 16, 1806, imposed a paper blockade of the British Isles, outstripping in its defiance of neutral rights Britain's own blockade. The Milan Decree, of Dec. 17, 1807, eclipsed even this, by declaring lawful prey ships submitting to the British Orders in Council. The Bayonne Decree, of April 17, 1808, further mocked the neutrals by representing the seizure of American shipping as co-operation with Jefferson in enforcing the Embargo⁹⁴. Similarly, the Rambouillet Decree, drafted March 23, published May 14, 1810, legalized seizure of American shipping as retaliation for a proviso in the Nonimportation⁹⁵ law. Climaxing Napoleonic hypocrisy was the Cadore Letter, of Aug. 5, 1810, deceptively revoking the Continental Decrees contingent upon British abandonment of the Orders in Council.

[Frank Edgar Melvin, *Napoleon's Navigation System*, unpublished, University of Pennsylvania Thesis; L. M. Sears, *Jefferson and the Embargo*.]

LOUIS MARTIN SEARS

Narcotics and Narcotic Drug Acts. The Federal Government has carried on an active fight for more than a quarter of a century against the abuse of narcotic drugs. On Feb. 9, 1909, a law was enacted by the Congress prohibiting the importation of smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking, and making it unlawful to import opium for other than medicinal purposes (*see* Opium Trade). This law, known as the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act since its revision and re-enactment on May 26, 1922, restricts importations of narcotics to such amounts of crude opium and coca leaves as are necessary to pro-

vide for the medicinal and legitimate uses of the country, the importation of crude opium for the purpose of manufacturing heroin being prohibited. It also places certain restrictions on the exportation of narcotics.

On Dec. 17, 1914, Congress enacted an internal revenue measure, effective April 1, 1915, commonly known as the Harrison Narcotic Law. This law, as amended, requires all persons who import, manufacture, sell, or dispense narcotics to register and pay an occupational tax, to render returns, and, with certain exceptions, to make all sales, exchanges, etc. of narcotics in pursuance of government order forms. All narcotics entering into domestic trade must be tax-stamped. The Marihuana Tax Act of 1937, effective Oct. 1, 1937, has similar provisions with respect to marihuana (*Cannabis sativa* L.), a transfer tax being substituted for the stamp tax imposed under the Harrison Act. These several laws placed enforcement responsibility in the Treasury Department.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics, under the mandate of an act of Congress, co-operated with the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in the drafting of a Uniform Narcotic Drug Act, which, with slight modifications in some instances, has been passed in thirty-nine states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. This law is designed to regulate the manufacture, sale, etc. of opium, coca leaves, and their derivatives, and to restrict the use of these drugs to medical and scientific purposes. Thirty-one of the states and the District of Columbia have included provisions with respect to cannabis. However, all of the states have legislation of some nature relating to this drug.

[Annual Reports of the United States Government to Congress and to the League of Nations for the Years 1930 to 1938 entitled, *Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs*; Arthur Woods, *Dangerous Drugs*.]

H. J. ANSLINGER

Narragansett Bay was visited in 1524 by Giovanni da Verrazano and described in his letter to King Francis of France, printed in 1556 and reprinted in English in 1582. It is called "G (Gulf) del Refugio" on the 1529 map of Hieronymus da Verrazano. It appears as "b de Sanct. Baptista" (bay of St. John the Baptist) on the Chaves 1537 map and is called "Bahia de San Johan Baptista" by Oviedo in 1537. This name in various forms continued to be used until the end of the 16th century. It is also called "Baia Honda," "Baia Hermosa" and "Bay des Iles." In 1583 John Dee called it the "Dee River" after himself.

The Dutch explorers and traders recognized the three branches of the bay and called the west

passage "Sloep Bay" (Sloup Bay, Chaloup Bay), the east or middle passage "Anker Bay" and the Sakonnet River the "Nieuwe River" or the "Bay van Nassau."

The English settlers called it Narragansett Bay, though with much variation in spelling, naming it after the Narragansett tribe of Indians⁹⁰ who lived on its west shore.

[H. M. Chapin, *Cartography of Rhode Island*.]

HOWARD M. CHAPIN

Narragansett Indians, THE, were a tribe located in what is now Washington County, R. I., on the west side of Narragansett Bay. Shortly before the arrival of the English colonists in 1620, the Narragansett sachems had imposed their authority on the Niantics to the west, the Cowesets, Shawomets and Nipmucs to the north, the Wampanoags and Massachusetts on the east and northeast, and the tribes on Block Island and on the eastern end of Long Island. Their rule extended to Weymouth on the northeast and to Mount Wachusett on the north.

Roger Williams went among the Narragansetts, learned their language and was deeded by them the land where he built Providence. Subsequently they deeded land to the Rhode Island and Warwick settlers. The Narragansetts joined the English in the Pequot War⁹¹ in 1637. Their chief Miantonomi was killed in a war with the Mohegans⁹² in 1643, and in 1644 the Narragansetts for their own protection submitted themselves as subjects of the king of England.

They joined the Wampanoags in King Philip's War in 1675, and suffered a terrible defeat in the Great Swamp Fight⁹³. After the war the scattered Narragansetts merged with the Niantics, whose sachem Ninigret became sachem of the Narragansetts.

[Samuel G. Drake, *The Book of the Indians of North America*; H. M. Chapin, *The Sachems of the Narragansetts*.]

HOWARD M. CHAPIN

Narragansett Planters were a group of stock and dairy farmers living in the southern portion of the colony of Rhode Island, who, by careful breeding, developed the renowned Narragansett Pacer. They were slaveholders on a large scale. From the last quarter of the 17th century their prosperity, mainly derived from intercolonial and West Indian trade, increased until curbed by the strict enforcement of trade regulations prior to the Revolution. Wealth, and the opportunities afforded by the cultural influences of Newport, developed a mode of life unique in the northern colonial countryside, resembling more that of the South.

[Edward Channing, *The Narragansett Planters, A Study*

in *Cause*s, Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science; William Davis Miller, *The Narragansett Planters, Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, New Series, Vol. 43, Part 1, pp. 49-115, 1933.]

WILLIAM DAVIS MILLER

Narrows, THE, a strait connecting the upper and lower New York bays, was entered by the explorer Verrazano in 1524, and first shown on Ramusio's map in 1556. It was fortified about 1710, and more strongly for the War of 1812. A semaphore telegraph, to announce the sighting of vessels, was erected there in 1812.

[I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Narváez Expedition, THE Pánfilo de Narváez received from Charles V on Nov. 17, 1526, a patent to explore and reduce to Spanish rule all the lands from Soto la Marina northeastward around the Gulf of Mexico to the "Isle of Florida." With 400 men and 80 horses, he landed from his five ships at Tampa Bay, April 14, 1528. Marching north along the coast in search of the Indian country of Apalache, he lost contact with his ships, and, after battles with the Indians at Apalache, he and his men were reduced by famine to the desperate plan of building crude flat-boats in which to follow the coast from Apalache Bay westward to the Spanish settlements on the Río Pánuco. Despite bad weather and starvation the surviving 247 men managed to follow the Gulf coast as far as Texas, where the flotilla broke up among the coastal islands near Galveston Bay, Narváez perishing there in a storm in November, 1528. The treasurer of the expedition, Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, with a few survivors lived among the coastal Texan Indians for about six years. Then, utilizing their reputations as healers and traders, Cabeza de Vaca^o and three companions, including a Moorish slave, Estebanico, sought to reach the Pánuco on foot. Turned back in northeastern Mexico, they performed the justly famous feat of traversing the continent by ascending, in general, the Río Grande Valley, crossing the Sierra Madre ranges and wandering down through Sonora to be rescued by Spaniards near Culiacán, in modern Sinaloa, in March of 1536. The account of their journey and of the Indian lands they had visited or heard about seems to have been a stimulus to the viceroy of New Spain, Antonio de Mendoza, in despatching the Coronado expedition^o in 1540. Narváez's patent was taken over by Hernando de Soto^o in 1537.

[F. Bandelier, trans., *The Journey of Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca*; M. Bishop, *The Odyssey of Cabeza de Vaca*; J. B. Brebner, *The Explorers of North America*, 1492-

1806; W. Lowery, *The Spanish Settlements within the Present Limits of the United States, 1513-1561*.]

RUFUS KAY WYLLYS

Nashoba, a co-operative or communistic settlement of slaves near Memphis, Tenn., established in 1825 by Frances Wright, a reformer from Scotland. Through the organization of such communities of from 50 to 100 members each, she planned to prepare slaves for their freedom, after which they were to be colonized outside the United States. But the founder of Nashoba soon became too ill to continue its management, and those left in charge proved incompetent. Within five years the experiment was completely abandoned.

[William Randall Waterman, *Frances Wright*.]

L. W. NEWTON

Nashville. Founded in the winter of 1779-80 by migrations under James Robertson and John Donelson from the Holston settlements^o to French Lick near the Cumberland River, until 1800 Nashville was a frontier outpost constantly threatened by Indians. By the beginning of the new century, however, its permanence was certain, and long before it became the state capital in 1825 it had become for its day an extremely mature town. The fertility of the Cumberland Basin attracted wealthy investors and speculators, and soon after the arrival of the first steamboat^o in 1818 it developed into a commercial and manufacturing center. Politically and economically it had already outdistanced Knoxville and the older eastern section of the state, and as a result of the suitability of its hinterland to cotton, its population increased from 7000 in 1830 to 17,000 in 1860. Two of its citizens, Andrew Jackson and James K. Polk, became Presidents of the United States, and in national politics it wielded an influence out of all proportion to its size.

One of the more cultured and aristocratic cities of the ante-bellum South—largely because it did not experience the mushroom growth of some of its rivals, such as Memphis—it was so strongly Whig that its citizens were able to defeat the secession movement at the Nashville Convention^o of 1850.

[T. P. Abernethy, *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee*.]

GERALD M. CAPERS, JR.

Nashville, Battle of (Dec. 15-16, 1864), was the dramatic winter conflict in which George H. Thomas, with a hastily organized army of heterogeneous troops, moved out of Nashville and fell upon the Confederate forces of John B. Hood. On the first day the Confederates were pushed back. On the following day, while feinting and

holding on his left wing, Thomas pressed forward on his right and drove the Confederates in disorderly retreat from the battlefield. Sometimes described as perfect tactics, this victory of Thomas' freed Tennessee of organized Confederate forces and marked the end of Hood's Tennessee campaign⁷⁰.

[Thomas Robson Hay, *Hood's Tennessee Campaign*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, THE, chartered in 1845 and completed in 1854, was the first Tennessee railroad to be completed. Designed as an extension of a railroad line from Charleston by way of Atlanta to Chattanooga (see Western and Atlantic Railroad), it assisted in providing the Middle West with an outlet to the South Atlantic seaboard, contributed to the development of Atlanta and Chattanooga as important ante-bellum railway centers and attained considerable military significance during the Civil War. Following the acquisition of several connecting lines it became the Nashville, Chattanooga and St. Louis Railroad in 1873.

[T. D. Clark, Development of the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, Ser. II, Vol. III, No. 1.]

S. J. FOLMSBEE

Nashville Convention, THE (June 3-12, Nov. 11-18, 1850). Many Southern statesmen believed that a united Southern party was necessary if slavery and Southern rights were to be maintained within the Union. A caucus of Southern delegates in Congress adopted and published an "Address . . . to their Constituents" in 1850, but the leaders felt that a Southern convention would be more effective. John C. Calhoun wrote a letter to Collin S. Tarpley⁷¹ of Mississippi suggesting that his state issue the call for the convention. The Mississippi state convention (Jackson, Oct. 1, 1849) resolved "that a convention of the slave-holding States should be held in Nashville, Tenn., . . . to devise and adopt some mode of resistance" to Northern aggressions. In response to this call delegates from nine states, chosen by popular vote, by conventions, by state legislatures or appointed by governors, assembled at Nashville. Both Whig and Democratic delegates were chosen but the latter predominated. Many of the outstanding political leaders of the South were among those elected. The Convention unanimously adopted twenty-eight resolutions which maintained that slavery existed independent of but was recognized by the Constitution. They asserted that the territories belonged to the people of the states, that the citizens of the several states had equal rights to

migrate to the territories, that Congress had no power to exclude them but was obligated to protect them. The resolutions then expressed a willingness to settle the matter by extending the Missouri Compromise⁷² line to the Pacific. The Convention also adopted an address to the people of the Southern states which condemned the Clay resolutions then before Congress. Reassembling six weeks after Congress had adopted the Compromise of 1850⁷³, with a changed and more radical membership, the Convention rejected the Compromise and called upon the Southern states to secede from the Union. The second session of the Convention was a fiasco, however, for Southern sentiment rapidly crystallized in support of the Compromise.

[Cleo Hearon, *Mississippi and the Compromise of 1850*; D. T. Herndon, *The Nashville Convention of 1850*, Alabama Historical Society Publications, Vol. V, Resolutions and Address, Adopted by the Southern Convention; St. G. L. Sioussat, Tennessee, the Compromise of 1850 and the Nashville Convention, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. II.]

FLETCHER M. GREEN

Nassau, Fort (on Delaware River), was built by Cornelius Jacobsen May in 1623, at the mouth of Big Timber Creek (Gloucester Co., N. J.). Garrisoned intermittently until 1636, the fort gave to the Dutch fur traders a dominant position in the valley. When Gov. Stuyvesant erected Fort Casimir⁷⁴ on the lower Delaware (1651) to compel the evacuation of the Swedish Fort Elfsborg, he abandoned and destroyed Fort Nassau.

[Christopher Ward, *The Dutch and Swedes on the Delaware*.]

C. A. TITUS

Nast Cartoons, appearing in *Harper's Weekly* (1862-86), not only marked the beginning of the modern political cartoon⁷⁵ but were a great force in contemporary politics. Thomas Nast, a German-born artist, began as a news illustrator for *Leslie's*, but later joined *Harper's* and stirred emotions with his Civil War pictures. In 1864 he satirized the compromise "Chicago platform," and the Copperheads⁷⁶, and henceforth his pictures were largely political.

In the Reconstruction⁷⁷ period Nast was relentless in his attacks on Johnson and Seward, and began to employ his talent for caricature. His greatest work, however, was in the exposure of the Tweed Ring⁷⁸ in New York City. One cartoon asked, "Who stole the people's money?" as each member of the "ring" pointed to his neighbor, "'Twas him." Again Tweed and his minions were vultures on the body of New York City, "Waiting for the storm to blow over." And finally they bowed before the gallows, "The only

thing they respect." It was a Nast cartoon which identified Tweed in Europe, and thus effected his capture.

In national politics *Harper's* was usually Republican, and in 1872 Nast mercilessly caricatured the "Liberals," Greeley and Schurz. After the "cipher dispatches"⁷⁰ of 1878 Tilden was shown repeatedly as an Egyptian mummy on whose wrinkled brow was the word "Fraud." In 1884, however, *Harper's* bolted with the Mugwumps⁷¹, and Nast's pen depicted Blaine with three dilapidated plumes and a carpetbag labeled, "Are 20 Years of Blaine Enough?"

Beginning with elaborate pictorial cartoons and long, descriptive captions, often utilizing Shakespearean themes, Nast later evolved the direct and simple design, now regarded as most effective. He invented the symbolic Republican elephant, Democratic donkey and Tammany tiger. His skill in caricature and composition, and the variety of his conceptions made him ever popular; and his cartoons are still regarded as incisive commentaries on the politics of the period.

[A. B. Paine, *Th. Nast, His Period and His Pictures.*]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Nat Turner's Rebellion of Aug. 21, 1831, at Southampton, Va., seventy miles from Richmond, raised Southern fears of a general servile war to their highest point. As a "leader" or lay Negro preacher, Nat Turner exercised a strong influence over his race. He believed himself a supernatural instrument to lead his people out of bondage. On the fatal August night, he led a band of sixty or seventy slaves to the large plantations, killing fifty-five whites before the community could act. This outbreak, following repeated disclosures of slave plots in Virginia and elsewhere, exercised a profound influence upon the attitude of the South toward slavery. After a consideration of the arguments of emancipationists during the legislative session of 1831-32, Virginia rejected them in favor of strengthening the police measures against the slave. Other Southern states, fearing a repercussion of Nat Turner's insurrection, attributed in some quarters to abolitionist propaganda⁷², passed more stringent slave laws and Negro education became more than ever an object of suspicion.

[H. Wish, *American Slave Insurrections before 1861, Journal of Negro History*, XXII; T. M. Whitfield, *Slavery Agitation in Virginia, 1820-1832.*]

HARVEY WISH

Nataqua, The Proposed Territory of, originated in a movement of the citizens of Honey Lake Valley, Calif., in 1856, to organize an in-

Natchez

dependent territory. Believing they were too far east to be in California, and not liking the government of Carson County, Utah, they met and adopted laws and regulations for the new territory and elected a recorder and surveyor. Nothing came of the movement.

[Asa M. Fairfield, *History of Lassen County, California.*]

JEANNE ELIZABETH WIER

Natchez, Miss. In 1716 Bienville, in accordance with his policy of extending the French colonial domain up the Mississippi Valley from the Gulf, established Fort Rosalie⁷³ (Natchez) on the lowest of the several bluffs on the Mississippi. By 1729 it had become a settlement of 700, but in that year the Natchez Indians⁷⁴, resenting the treatment they had received from the French, destroyed it.

Not until 1763, when the site came into English possession, was any attempt made at the reestablishment of Natchez (*see* Panmure, Fort). During the Revolution its less than 100 inhabitants, mostly English, were divided into two bitter factions of patriots and loyalists. After several years of fighting both groups were overpowered by the Spanish, who in turn surrendered the post to the United States in 1798, in compliance with the terms of Pinckney's Treaty⁷⁵ (*see* Guion's Expedition).

Under the lenient Spanish rule after 1780, Natchez prospered. Tobacco, indigo and cotton⁷⁶ were introduced, and the town grew so rapidly that by the end of the second decade of American occupation it contained over 2000 inhabitants. With the increasing production of cotton and the advent of the steamboat⁷⁷ on the Mississippi, it was converted from an isolated frontier outpost into a center of planter aristocracy, second only to New Orleans in the entire Southwest. By the middle of the century, however, because of the rush of population to richer sections of Mississippi and the proximity of New Orleans, it had become apparent that the early commercial promise of Natchez would not be fulfilled; yet its cultural contribution and its historical importance in the Old Southwest can hardly be overemphasized.

[Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi*; C. Sydnor, *A Gentleman of the Old Natchez Region.*]

GERALD M. CAPERS, JR.

Natchez, THE, were a Muskogean tribe occupying nine villages on the east side of the Mississippi between the Yazoo and Pearl rivers, including in 1700 about 1000 warriors. Of a high degree of civilization, evidenced by considerable skill in the arts, the Natchez for their livelihood depended primarily on agriculture. They prac-

tised an extreme form of sun worship and engaged in occasional human sacrifice. They exercised a powerful influence over neighboring tribes, and were at first friendly with the French who were allowed to build Fort Rosalie^{ss} in 1716. Arbitrary and despotic action on the part of the latter led to serious outbreaks. In 1723 the Natchez were almost crushed by Bienville. An Indian conspiracy planned for 1728 proved abortive but on Nov. 28, 1729, over 200 Frenchmen were slain on the St. Catherine. This led to a war of extinction on the part of the French and their Choctaw^{ss} allies. The Natchez, forced to abandon their villages in 1730, were dispersed but not exterminated. Nearly 450, captured in Louisiana, were sold into West Indian slavery, while some reached haven in northern Mississippi with the Chickasaws^{ss}, others on a tributary of the Coosa River and still more in South Carolina.

[John W. Monette, *History of the Discovery and Settlement of the Valley of the Mississippi*.]

JAMES W. SILVER

Natchez, Treaty of (May 14, 1790), between Gov. Gayoso and the Choctaw and Chickasaw nations^{ss}, confirmed boundaries of the Natchez District as set originally by the British and the Indians: on the west, the Mississippi; on the east, a line from the Yazoo, a few miles above Walnut Hills, running south into Florida.

[American State Papers, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. I, p. 280.]

MACK SWEARINGEN

Natchez Campaign of 1813, THE, was waged against the Creek Indians^{ss} of the Tombigbee and Alabama rivers region, then the eastern frontier of Mississippi Territory. The Indians threatened hostilities early in 1813, and a brigade of volunteers from the Natchez country, commanded by F. L. Claiborne, was ordered to Fort Stodert^{ss}, on the Tombigbee River. Following the massacre at Fort Mims^{ss}, Aug. 30, 1813, Claiborne was reinforced, and was able to destroy the Creek stronghold at the Holy Ground^{ss} (in present Lowndes County, Ala.), Dec. 23, 1813 (see Creek War).

[Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi*; C. E. Carter, ed., *Territorial Papers of the United States*, VI.]

EDGAR B. NIXON

Natchez Massacre (1729). See Natchez, The.

Natchez Trace, THE, was a road running more than 500 miles from Nashville, Tenn., to Natchez^{ss} on the Mississippi River, following roughly an old Indian trail. When in 1795 the United States acquired a clear title from Spain (see Pinckney's Treaty) to the Old Southwest, and

when eight years later it purchased Louisiana^{ss} from Napoleon, the economic and military necessity of adequate roads through the southwestern wilderness to the Gulf spurred the Government into action. By far the most famous and important of the roads which resulted was the Natchez Trace. In 1801 Gen. James Wilkinson obtained the right of way by treaties with the Chickasaws and Choctaws (see Adams, Fort), and in 1806 Congress authorized President Jefferson to begin construction. In a few years wagons were using the road, but for several decades most of its traffic was northward, since settlers would float their produce down the Mississippi to market on flatboats^{ss} and return over the robber-infested Trace by foot or on horseback.

[E. B. Stanton, *Natchez Trace*; Robert Coates, *Outlaw Years*.]

GERALD M. CAPERS, JR.

Natchitoches, La., began as a French trading post, established by Louis de St. Denis^{ss} in the winter of 1713-14 among the Natchitoches Indians, near the site of the present city. Soon thereafter it was garrisoned and fortified, becoming an outpost against neighboring Spanish establishments in Texas. For a century the settlement was a military-commercial center with a cosmopolitan population composed eventually of French, Spanish, Anglo-American and other elements. Besides the Indian trade, it carried on an extensive traffic, mostly contraband, with the Spaniards to the west, French manufactured articles and foodstuffs being exchanged for cattle, horses, mules, hides and silver, which went in turn to other points on the Mississippi. In the later 18th century local produce exported from Natchitoches included indigo, tobacco of superior quality, bear oil, tallow, dressed skins and meats.

During the Franco-Spanish war of 1719, the commandant of Natchitoches drove the Spaniards temporarily from their posts in northeastern Texas. In 1731 St. Denis, with Spanish assistance, repulsed an attack of the Natchez Indians on the fort. In 1735-36 and again in 1751-53 Natchitoches figured in inconclusive Franco-Spanish boundary controversies. In 1806, as a United States border post, it became the center of military and diplomatic maneuvers culminating in the Neutral Ground Agreement^{ss}.

Natchitoches served as a gateway for explorers, as St. Denis (1713, 1716), LaHarpe (1719), DeMézières (1770-79), Vial (1787) and Pike^{ss} (1807); for adventurers and filibusters^{ss} entering Texas, as Nolan (1799-1801), Gutierrez^{ss} and Magee (1811-13) and James Long^{ss} (1819); and for Anglo-American colonists brought to Texas

after 1821 by Stephen F. Austin and others, as well as for settlers going to Arkansas. The town was a military post of some importance at the time of the Texas Revolution (1836) and the Mexican War (1846-48), and during the Red River Campaign⁹⁹⁹ of the Civil War it was captured (March 31, 1864) by Union forces, being evacuated by them following the failure of Banks' campaign against Shreveport.

After 1850 Natchitoches yielded its primacy as head of navigation for the Red River steamboat traffic to Grand Ecore, when the main channel of the Red River shifted.

[H. E. Bolton, *Athanase de Mézières and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1768-1780*; Alcée Fortier, *A History of Louisiana*; G. P. Garrison, *Texas: A Contest of Civilizations*; C. W. Hackett, *Pichardo's Treatise on the Limits of Louisiana and Texas*; W. F. McCaleb, *The Aaron Burr Conspiracy*; Natchitoches Parish, in *Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Northwestern Louisiana*; G. Portré-Bobinski and C. M. Smith, *Natchitoches*.]

CHARMION SHELBY

National Academy of Sciences was created by Congress in 1863 to give scientific advice to government departments upon request. Quasi-governmental, it is unique, its nearest equivalents being the Royal Society and the French Academy. It elects its own members, limited to 350, who must be United States citizens, and 50 foreign associates. Its monumental building is opposite Lincoln Memorial, in Washington.

[*Annual Reports of the National Academy of Sciences*.]

WATSON DAVIS

National Army, THE. This term was part of our World War vocabulary and persisted popularly long after it had been officially abolished. An act of Congress (approved May 18, 1917) authorized the President to increase the military establishment temporarily. Under this, the War Department ordered the formation of sixteen "National Army" infantry divisions, to be numbered from seventy-six to ninety-one, inclusive. Under the new setup the component parts of the army were defined under three headings, Regular Army, National Guard and National Army, the latter named being designed primarily to absorb those men brought into service by the draft⁹⁹⁹.

The term "National Army" was abolished by the War Department on Aug. 7, 1918, and a single term, "The United States Army" substituted for the three terms given above. Popularly, however, those American divisions numbered from seventy-six to one hundred two, inclusive, were long spoken of as our "National Army."

[Acts of Congress; War Department *General Orders* Nos. 88, 95, 101, 115 for 1917 and No. 73 for 1918.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is a private interracial organization formed in 1910. Organized in more than 300 branches, the association is working for the civil and political equality of the Negro, striving especially to end lynchings and disfranchisement⁹⁹⁹; for increased educational opportunities, for improved economic and social conditions for sharecroppers and tenant farmers, to promote legislation for the Negro's advancement; and to lead in "militant and specific attacks upon the economic barriers" in his path.

[*Annual Reports of the Association*; M. W. Ovington, *How the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Began*.]

P. ORMAN RAY

National Association of Manufacturers, THE, organized in 1895 to promote domestic and foreign trade, has become the largest and most influential nontrade association protecting the general commercial and labor interests of all manufacturing industries. Since 1902 the association has maintained an active labor-relations policy, vigorously opposing the boycott, blacklist, lockout strike, closed shop⁹⁹⁹, union label and any interference with employment. The labor, legislative and political program is fostered through two affiliated organizations—The League for Industrial Rights (1902) and The National Industrial Council (1907).

[*Annual Proceedings of the Association*; Clarence E. Bonnett, *Employers' Associations in the United States*; Albion G. Taylor, *Labor Policies of the National Association of Manufacturers*.]

JOSEPH H. FOTH

National Bank Notes. The act of Feb. 25, 1863 (repealed and re-enacted in amended form June 3, 1864), authorized the issuance of national bank notes by national banks⁹⁹⁹. Each national bank was required to deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury United States bonds in a minimum amount of not less than one third of its capital stock and not less than \$30,000 in any event. Circulating notes, guaranteed by the Government, might be issued up to 90% of the par value of such deposited bonds. Note issues of any bank were limited to the amount of its capital stock and, until 1875, total issues of national banks were limited (to \$300,000,000 up to 1870 and \$354,000,000 thereafter). After 1900 notes might be issued to the full par value of the deposited bonds.

National bank notes were never a satisfactory currency, the amount in circulation fluctuating more closely with the price of government bonds than with the needs of business. Nevertheless, they constituted our sole bank note currency un-

til 1914 and remained in circulation after the establishment of the Federal Reserve System⁹⁹ until 1935, when the bonds bearing the circulation privilege were retired by the Treasury.

[F. A. Bradford, *Money and Banking*; E. W. Kemmerer, *The A B C of the Federal Reserve System*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

National Banking System. See Banks, National.

National Committee, THE, of the major parties represents, in theory, the unity of the party. Membership includes one man and one woman from each state and most of the territories. First used by the Democrats in 1848 and by the Republicans in 1856, the committee is formally designated every four years by the national convention⁹⁹. Actually, its members are selected according either to state law or to party rule. The committee is usually of little significance in its collective capacity; the chairman, named by the presidential candidate, and a small executive committee usually dominate the situation. The members are active and influential, however, in state politics.

[E. M. Sait, *American Parties and Elections*; E. B. Logan, ed., *American Political Scene*.]

THOMAS S. BARCLAY

National Debt of the United States. See Debt, Public.

National Defense Act. First enacted in 1916 under the impulsion of the "preparedness" movement⁹⁹, and extensively amended in 1920 as a result of World War experiences, the National Defense Act, depending on volunteer citizen effort, retained our traditionally small standing army, utilized local traditions and energy of National Guardsmen⁹⁹ and created a skeleton Reserve framework for wartime increments. It greatly augmented training facilities and activities in both military and civilian circles. This act, viewing a warlike world, avoided the unsuitable alternatives of a huge standing force, a hastily raised, untrained militia and universal peacetime conscription⁹⁹. Compromising effectively between dual desires for Federal control and state initiative, it provided an organization, and scarcely more than that, by which World War experience and civilian unit pride might be preserved instead of being lost with the Armistice and demobilization⁹⁹.

[J. Dickinson, *The Building of an Army*.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

National Education Association. This, the largest professional educational organization in

the United States, was chartered by Congress in 1906, after having been organized in 1871 as the National Educational Association, which grew out of the National Teachers' Association, established in 1857. Through the activity of this organization a department of education was established in the National Government in 1867. The association has a membership of nearly 250,000, occupies its own building in Washington, D. C., publishes an important educational journal, yearbooks, research and other studies, and otherwise promotes educational effort.

[E. P. Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States*; Edgar W. Knight, *Education in the United States*.]

EDGAR W. KNIGHT

National Gazette, THE (1791-93), was started in Philadelphia, Oct. 31, 1791, under the patronage of Jefferson, who subsidized its editor, Philip Freneau, with the position of translator in the State Department. It was intended to oppose the Federalist *United States Gazette*; but its attacks on Hamilton's policies angered Washington, who held Jefferson responsible. It discontinued shortly after Jefferson's resignation.

[W. G. Bleyer, *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism*.]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

National Guard. The development of the National Guard has been an evolution—first the "Train-bands" of old England, then, successively, the colonial militia⁹⁹, state militias, National Guard of the states and National Guard of the United States. The trained militia regiments of the colonial period suffered eclipse through neglect by Congress, but many, nevertheless, were kept alive by interested and influential citizens. From the act of May 8, 1792, until passage of the Dick Bill in 1903 there was practically no national trend toward a uniform militia system. The Dick Bill divided the militia into (1) organized militia to be known as National Guard of the state and (2) a remainder known as reserve militia. Conformity with Regular Army armament and discipline was provided as well as instruction by Regular Army personnel. The President was authorized to call the militia for constitutional purposes for a period not exceeding nine months. In 1908 the Dick Bill was amended to remove the restriction of nine-months service only and also to allow the use of these troops outside the continental limits of the United States.

The National Defense Act⁹⁹, June 3, 1916, provided that existing and new militia units "shall conform to such rules and regulations regarding organization, strength and armament as

60 National Industrial Recovery

the President may prescribe." By amendment of this same act, June 4, 1920, the National Guard took its place along with the Regular Army and the Organized Reserve as a definite component of the Army of the United States²⁰.

The National Guard is organized into eighteen infantry and four cavalry divisions, with a pro rata proportion of Corps, Army and GHQ reserve troops. A total strength of 210,000 is provided, apportioned among the forty-eight states, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. Seventeen National Guard divisions participated in the World War.

[John W. Gulick, *The National Guard as a Federal Force*; Edmund C. Brush, *The National Guard and Its Relation to the General Government*; John W. Heavey, *Development of the National Guard*, in the *Infantry Journal*, February, 1921.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

National Industrial Recovery Act. See National Recovery Administration.

National Intelligencer, THE, a conservative triweekly newspaper, issuing a weekly edition, styled *National Intelligencer and Washington Advertiser*, was established by Samuel H. Smith in Washington, D. C., Oct. 31, 1800, as the official organ of the Jefferson party (see Republican Party, Jeffersonian). *Washington Advertiser* was dropped from the title in 1810, and in 1813 the *Intelligencer* became a daily which continued until 1870. Smith sold it in 1810 to Joseph Gales, Jr., who in 1812 took William W. Seaton into a partnership which lasted until Gales' death in 1860. The *Intelligencer* was the organ of administrations until J. Q. Adams' Presidency; became a Whig paper during Jackson's regime; was supplanted by the *Republic* as the Whig official organ during Taylor's Presidency; and was returned to favor during Fillmore's administration. The daily edition was merged with the weekly in 1870, moved to New York, and soon was discontinued.

[F. Hudson, *Journalism in the United States from 1690 to 1872*; W. G. Bleyer, *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism*.]

W. B. HATCHER

National Labor Relations Act, THE (July 5, 1935), guaranteed to employees "the right to self-organization" and "to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing." Five unfair practices on the part of employers were prohibited by the act. Employers might not interfere with their employees' rights to self-organization and collective bargaining²¹; they might not promote company unions; they might not discriminate in the matter of employment;

National Labor Relations

they might not discharge or otherwise discriminate against employees who file charges or give testimony under the act; and, finally, they might not "refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives" of their employees.

[*Statutes at Large*, Vol. 48.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

National Labor Relations Board, THE, consisting of three members, was created as an independent agency by the National Labor Relations Act²² of 1935. The members have five-year terms and receive annual salaries of \$10,000 each. They are appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate. Any member may be removed by the President "for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office but for no other reason."

The Board has the right to make its own rules and regulations. If a controversy arises over employee representation, the Board is empowered to determine who are to be the representatives. Furthermore, the organization is authorized to hold hearings on any complaint that an employer is engaged in any of the five unfair practices affecting interstate commerce as defined in the labor law. If the Board decides the accused has engaged in an unfair practice, it is to issue a "cease and desist" order. In case obedience is refused, the Board may petition any circuit court of appeals for enforcement of the order.

During its first three years, the Board handled 14,207 cases involving a total of 3,579,000 workers. Of these cases, 10,447 had been settled—55% by mutual agreement of employers and employees, 40% by withdrawal or dismissal, and 5% by formal Board action. Only 1% of the cases had been taken to court.

In the first cases appealed to the Supreme Court in 1937 and 1938, the Board was uniformly successful. Particularly important was the opinion in the case of *National Labor Relations Board v. Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation*²³, handed down on April 12, 1937. The Court majority for the first time granted that the labor relations of manufacturers engaged in interstate commerce were subject to Federal regulation.

By 1939 criticism of the Board and of the one-sided law under which it operated had become so intense as to cause the House of Representatives to set up a committee to investigate it. This committee began hearings on Dec. 11, 1939, to discover the reasons for the criticism so that recommendations might be made to Congress for legislative changes.

[*Statutes at Large*, Vol. 48; 57 Sup. Ct. 615]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

National Labor Relations Board v. Jones and Laughlin Steel Corp., decided by the Supreme Court on April 12, 1937, by a five-to-four vote, upheld the validity of the National Labor Relations Act⁷ of 1935. The Court accepted the findings of the Board, designed to show that the steel company was engaged in interstate commerce. By bringing in raw materials from other states and then shipping its finished products to points outside the state in which they were made, the company was engaged in activities which were in the "stream" of commerce. The "stoppage" of these activities "by industrial strife would have a most serious effect upon interstate commerce," an effect which "would be immediate and might be catastrophic," the Court majority declared. This majority had "no doubt that Congress had constitutional authority to safeguard the right of respondent's [company's] employees to self-organization and freedom in the choice of representatives for collective bargaining." Therefore the Court reversed the lower court which had ruled that the Federal Government had no constitutional right to regulate labor relations in a manufacturing establishment. This was the first of fifteen formal decisions won by the National Labor Relations Board⁸ against three defeats, up to June, 1939.

[57 Sup. Ct. 615.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

National Monetary Commission, THE, was appointed in accordance with the provisions of the Aldrich-Vreeland Act⁹ of May 30, 1908, which provided for the appointment of a commission of eighteen members, to be composed of "nine members of the Senate . . . and nine members of the House of Representatives." The act further stated that it was to be the duty of this commission "to inquire into and report to Congress . . . what changes are necessary or desirable in the monetary system of the United States or in the laws relating to banking and currency."

The commission, with Sen. Aldrich as chairman, was duly appointed and proceeded to carry out its designated task. Experts were appointed to make studies of banking history and existing conditions in this and other countries, and, in the summer of 1908, members of the commission visited England, France and Germany to ascertain their banking arrangements, methods and practices by personal observation and interviews.

On Jan. 8, 1912, the commission submitted its report to Congress. The report contained a summary of the work done by the commission, and experts and others employed or interviewed by it, as well as a description and text of a proposed

law to remedy a number of existing defects as enumerated in the report.

The proposed law contained provisions for the establishment of a National Reserve Association with branches to act as a central bank for the United States (*see* Federal Reserve System). The monographs and articles, prepared for the commission by experts and published in conjunction with the report, numbered more than forty, and constituted, at the time, one of the most comprehensive banking libraries available.

[J. L. Laughlin, *The Federal Reserve Act, Its Origin and Problems*; P. M. Warburg, *The Federal Reserve System*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

National Parks. *See* Parks, National.

National Planning as a formal governmental responsibility (1) for the planned conservation and development of the natural resources of the country, and (2) for the planned integration of industrial processes including balancing of consumption and production and regulation of technological advance, had not been given much attention prior to the advent of the Roosevelt administration in 1933. On July 20, 1933, a National Planning Board which made several studies and reports was set up by the Public Works Administration¹⁰. This board was abolished by executive order June 30, 1934, and a National Resources Board created. On June 7, 1935, this board was abolished and the National Resources Committee established, the main functions of which are research and advisory.

[*United States Government Manual; Annual and Special Reports of the National Planning Board, National Resources Board, and National Resources Committee*.]

HARVEY PINNEY

National Recovery Administration. On June 16, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the National Industrial Recovery Act, an emergency¹¹ measure which was intended to be effective for two years. The act was designed to promote ten objectives, among which were "to remove obstructions to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce . . .," "to eliminate unfair competitive practices," to increase purchasing power, to improve the employment situation, and "to improve standards of labor." For the administration of the law the President was authorized to create such agencies and appoint such officials as he found to be necessary. One of the most important parts of the act was Section 3, which provided for the formulation of codes of fair competition which, when signed by the President, were to have the effect of laws. Another very important part was Section 7, which re-

quired the recognition in the codes of the rights of employees to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. This section also required employers to "comply with the maximum hours of labor, minimum rates of pay, and other conditions of employment, approved or prescribed by the President."

By an executive order issued immediately after signing the act, President Roosevelt created the National Recovery Administration headed by Administrator Hugh S. Johnson. During the period from June, 1933, to March, 1934, the N.R.A., as it was generally designated, was engaged chiefly in code making. In this period sixteen deputy administrators, working directly under Administrator Johnson, aided industrial committees in drawing up codes⁷⁰ of fair competition. Thereafter the organization was altered somewhat and enlarged in order to provide for more effective administration. Machinery was created to supervise the Code Authorities in charge of the codes and the agencies for compliance and enforcement were reorganized (*see* Blue Eagle Emblem).

Early in the fall of 1934 Administrator Johnson resigned his position. The President then issued an executive order, Sept. 27, reorganizing the recovery machinery. The administration of the recovery machinery was entrusted to a National Industrial Recovery Board composed of seven members. Exercising general supervision over this board was the Industrial Emergency Committee. Under a Code Administration Director were twelve industrial administrative divisions each with a division administrator. The Consumers, Industrial and Labor Advisory Boards created in 1933 were continued while the National Labor Relations Board⁷¹ replaced the earlier National Labor Board. In addition, there were Compliance, Legal and Research, and Planning divisions.

This general organization continued until after the Supreme Court, in the *Schechter* decision⁷² on May 27, 1935, invalidated the compulsory code system. Thereafter, on June 14, 1935, Congress voted to extend the recovery legislation until April 1, 1936, after repealing the provisions authorizing the President "to approve or prescribe codes of fair competition." After some drastic reorganization in the summer of 1935 the President officially terminated the life of the National Recovery Administration on Jan. 1, 1936, through an executive order issued the previous Dec. 21. During its existence this administration was responsible for 578 national codes together with 200 supplements affecting about 22,000,000 workers.

[Hugh S. Johnson, *The Blue Eagle from Egg to Earth*;

Leverett S. Lyon, et al., *The National Recovery Administration*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

National Republican Party. Every presidential elector chosen in 1824 was a Republican (*see* Campaign of 1824), but the party having failed to unite on a candidate, the electors divided their votes among four Republican leaders who sought the Presidency. The House election of 1825 followed, which resulted in the choice of John Quincy Adams on the first ballot. Because Adams won partly through the support of Henry Clay (*see* Corrupt Bargain) and his friends and then placed the Kentuckian in the Cabinet as Secretary of State, opposing elements drew together in support of Andrew Jackson. Thus the Jeffersonian Republicans⁷³ became divided into two parties. Leaders and members of both wings continued to call themselves Republicans, but often those who adhered to the administration were called Clay-Adams men, while those who rallied to the standard of Jackson were called Jackson men. As the years passed, members of the one party were referred to as National Republicans and those of the other as Democratic Republicans. Most of the Federalists remaining on the scene in 1825 gravitated to the National Republicans, though many of them joined the Jackson party. Accurately speaking, there were no Whigs and no Democrats until 1834. Then, the National Republican party was absorbed by the new and larger Whig party⁷⁴, and Democratic Republicans took on the name Democrats⁷⁵ during the next few years.

[William O. Lynch, *Fifty Years of Party Warfare*.]

WILLIAM O. LYNCH

National Research Council, THE, organized in 1916 at President Wilson's request by the National Academy of Sciences⁷⁶ for the assistance of the Government during the World War, was perpetuated thereafter for the encouragement of research in the natural sciences, especially by cooperative means. It has 220 members, mostly representatives of scientific and technical societies or research institutions. The Council is supported by a Carnegie Corporation⁷⁷ endowment and administers other funds for special research undertakings. Its members are grouped into nine divisions: physical sciences, engineering and industrial research, chemistry and chemical technology, geology and geography, medical sciences, biology and agriculture, anthropology and psychology, foreign relations, educational relations.

[*A History of the National Research Council, 1919-1933; Annual Reports of the National Academy of Sciences; Organization and Members*, National Research Council, 1937-38.]

WATSON DAVIS

National Road, a name often given to the Cumberland Road[™], the latter being the legal name. West of Wheeling[™] this famous artery of communication (macadamized) was commonly called the "United States" or "National" Road for it was the first, and for a long period the greatest, of such enterprises undertaken by the Federal Government. This western portion was probably not so significant as was the earlier built section, for much of the traffic in the West was diverted to steamboats on the Ohio River. As the interior of Ohio developed, however, the National Road through that state became a crowded highway and as many as a hundred teams often would be encountered in a journey of twenty miles. For some years construction west of Wheeling was uncertain because of constitutional scruples, held especially by Old School Republicans. The work was begun from Wheeling toward Zanesville, however, in 1825-26, following to that place the celebrated Zane's Trace[™]. By 1833 the road was opened to Columbus. The last appropriation for the road—in Ohio, Indiana and Illinois—was made by Congress in 1838. Following President Monroe's veto of a bill for the collection of tolls by the Federal Government (1822), parts of the road had been surrendered to the states, which undertook repairs and erected toll gates to insure the financing of such operations. The road through Indiana was completed only in 1850 by a state corporation. When Illinois received the custody of her portion, it was unfinished, although graded and bridged as far west as Vandalia, then the state capital.

The road meant less to Indiana and Illinois than to Ohio; and after 1850 the canal, the railroad and the telegraph[™] contributed generally to the decline of its importance. But today, as U. S. Route 40, it is a primary route for motor travel in the United States.

[Archer Butler Hulbert, *The Cumberland Road*.]

FRANCIS PHELPS WEISENBURGER

National Trades' and Workers' Association, THE, was started in 1910 at Battle Creek, Mich., by C. W. Post to fight trade unions. It replaced the Citizens' Industrial Association founded in 1902. *The Square Deal*, its organ, was filled with accounts of the bad things organized labor had done. It advocated arbitration for labor disputes and was against the closed shop, strikes, lockouts, boycotts and blacklisting[™]. Only a few locals were established. It stopped soon after Post's death in 1914.

[C. E. Bonnett, *Employers' Associations in the United States*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

National Tribune, THE, was founded as a soldier newspaper in 1877, in Washington, D. C., by George E. Lemon, the leading claim agent in securing pensions for soldiers of the Union Army (see Grand Army of the Republic). Within seven years after it was established this soldier newspaper boasted of a circulation of 112,000 paid subscribers. Its columns were filled with articles that appealed to the ex-soldiers. Its particular purpose, however, was to keep the soldiers posted on all pension legislation and urge them to work constantly for more liberal pensions[™]. In 1884 it became a political campaign sheet, and week after week called upon the soldiers to demand a "Soldier President." As the years passed and the ranks of the veterans thinned out, it ceased to be exclusively a soldier newspaper. It is still published (1939) as a weekly.

[Files of the *National Tribune*; *House Reports*, 48th Congress, 2nd Session, Vol. 3, No. 2863.]

JOHN W. OLIVER

National Union ("Arm-in-arm") Convention (Philadelphia, Aug. 14-16, 1866) was an effort by President Johnson's supporters to unite opposition to the Radical Republicans[™]. The convention platform stressed conciliation, state equality and acceptance of the results of the war, and called for election of conservatives to Congress. Copperhead[™] delegates withdrew to preserve harmony. Widely acclaimed at first, Radical successes in the congressional elections of 1866 demonstrated its failure.

[Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year*.]

CHARLES H. COLEMAN

National Union for Social Justice, THE, was organized by Rev. Charles E. Coughlin, a Michigan Catholic priest and popular radio speaker, April 25, 1935, its stated object being the protection of the masses against "domination of and exploitation by powerful vested interests." Units were quickly organized in many states. The Union was officially disbanded by Coughlin in the autumn of 1936, but continued to operate independently in many places. In October, 1937, Coughlin sold its weekly magazine, *Social Justice*, to one of its members, but in December he returned to the editorial staff. On Feb. 17, 1938, he suspended all units of the Union, but many were still functioning in 1939, when it was strongly antiradical in tone.

[Articles in *Forum*, April, 1935; *Literary Digest*, May 4, 1935; *Business Week*, May 18, 1935; *New York Times*, 1937-38.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

National University, *The Idea of a*, originated during the American Revolution as a proposition

to establish at the seat of the Federal Government a university under the auspices and patronage of the United States. The man most intimately associated with the original idea was George Washington. He recommended it to Congress, selected a site for it at Washington, D. C., and left an endowment in his will.

Several Presidents urged it upon Congress in the century following Washington's death but the idea has never been realized in the exact form of Washington's desire. Early in the present century Andrew Carnegie took up the idea but at length decided against it in favor of the Carnegie Institution⁹⁹. The original idea, however, continues to be proposed in bills before Congress.

[L. C. Helderman, *George Washington—Patron of Learning.*]

L. C. HELDERMAN

National Waterways Commission, THE, was established by Congress, March 3, 1909, upon recommendation of the Inland Waterways Commission⁹⁹, to investigate water transportation and river improvement and report to Congress. The commission of twelve congressmen submitted a preliminary report in 1910 on Great Lakes and inland waterways commerce. It urged continuance of investigations by army engineers, completion of projects under way, and opposed improvements not essential to navigation. A final report in 1912 favored the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, suggested further study on the Lake Erie-Lake Michigan Canal, opposed the Anacostia-Chesapeake Canal, and urged regulation of all water carriers by the Interstate Commerce Commission⁹⁹.

[*The American Year Book*, 1910; S. L. Miller, *Inland Transportation.*]

WILLIAM J. PETERSEN

Nationalist Sentiment. During the colonial period there was little national sentiment until the time of the American Revolution. Then, as James Wilson of Pennsylvania stated in the Federal Convention of 1787⁹⁹ (June 8), "Among the first sentiments expressed in the first [Continental] Congress one was that Virginia is no more, that Massachusetts is no more. . . . We are now one nation of brethren. We must bury all local interest and distinctions. This language continued for some time. The tables at length began to turn. No sooner were the State Governments formed than their jealousy and ambition began to display themselves . . . at length the confederation⁹⁹ became frittered down to the impotent condition in which it now stands." It was only by the efforts of the great leaders of the time that the extreme states' rights⁹⁹ view was overcome

and the Constitution⁹⁹ made, adopted, and the National Government put into effect.

Fortunately, during the first twelve years of our national history the control of our Government was in the hands of the leaders of the Federalist party⁹⁹ who were advocates of the nationalist viewpoint and thus the Federal Government was built upon strong foundations. The accession of Jefferson in 1801 and the control of the Government by the Republican (Jeffersonian) party⁹⁹, which advocated the protection of the states' rights, prevented undue centralization of national administration. This party and its successor, the Jackson Democratic party⁹⁹, remained in control of the Government for most of the time up to 1861. Due to natural economic and political causes, national union was a steady growth.

The great test between national and states' rights viewpoints came at the time of the Civil War, when the triumph of the Union cause and extreme use by Lincoln of the war powers of the President⁹⁹ gave the final victory to the nationalist sentiment. The impetus from these events, aided by enormous growth in our economic unity with its consequent political effects, has swept all before it. Added to this has been the weakness and inefficiency in many of our state governments. A political power unused is generally a power lost, and our National Government has taken over, with steadily increasing acceleration, the powers and prerogatives of the states.

The use by the New Deal⁹⁹ of these powers under the plea of emergency legislation⁹⁹ to meet a depression, as well as a skilful centralization of personal and predatory interests in national largesse under the form of relief⁹⁹, enabled partisan politicians to capitalize national authority for the purpose of strengthening party ties. This led to such an extreme centralization of national power and interest that the nationalist viewpoint swept all before it and brought the country to the verge of changing from a federal into a unitarian state.

[E. S. Corwin, *Twilight of the Supreme Court*; Walter Thompson, *Federal Centralization*; H. L. West, *Federal Power.*]

WILLIAM STARR MYERS

Nativism, the policy of favoring native inhabitants of a country as against immigrants, has through the course of American history fostered antagonism toward the Roman Catholic Church rather than toward any particular alien group. Until recent times many natives have consistently held to the belief that this Church endangered both the traditional Protestantism and the democratic institutions of the United States, and have

viewed foreigners with alarm because they were Catholics⁹⁹ rather than because of their alien birth.

This antipapal sentiment, brought to America by the first English colonists, was fostered in the new country by the 18th-century wars with Catholic France and Spain. Colonial laws and colonial writing both reflected this intolerance. The Revolution abruptly changed the American attitude toward Popery, the liberal spirit of the Declaration of Independence and the French Alliance of 1778 both contributed toward a more tolerant spirit which endured until the 1820's, despite the efforts of New England Federalists who were largely responsible for the antialien sections of the Alien and Sedition acts and the proposals of the Hartford Convention⁹⁹.

Anti-Catholic sentiment reappeared in the late 1820's, inspired by a mounting Catholic immigration and by the English propaganda which accompanied the passage of the Catholic Emancipation Act. Protestants, under the influence of the Finney revivalism⁹⁹, quickly rushed to the defense of their religion. A No-Popery newspaper, *The Protestant*, was founded in 1830 and a year later the New York Protestant Association began holding public discussions to "illustrate the history and character of Popery." By 1834 intolerance had grown to a point where the mob destruction of an Ursuline convent⁹⁹ at Charlestown, Mass., was condoned rather than condemned by the mass of the people. This sign of popular favor resulted in the launching of two new anti-Catholic papers, the *Downfall of Babylon* and the *American Protestant Vindicator*, the releasing of a flood of anti-Catholic books and pamphlets, and the formation of a national organization, the Protestant Reformation Society (1836).

The sensational propaganda spread by this society probably convinced many Protestants of the evils of Catholicism but it remained for the New York school controversy of the early 1840's to win over the churchgoing, middle class. In this controversy Catholic protests against the reading of the King James version of the Scriptures in the public schools were immediately misrepresented by propagandists who convinced Protestants that the papists were opposed to all Bible reading. Alarmed by this, the churches took up the cry against Rome, giving nativists sufficient strength to organize the American Republican party⁹⁹ with an anti-Catholic, antiforeign platform. Before more than local political success could be gained, a series of riots between natives and foreigners in Philadelphia⁹⁹ in 1844 turned popular sentiment against the whole No-Popery cru-

sade. For the remainder of the decade the Mexican War and the slavery controversy absorbed national attention.

Nativistic leaders, recognizing that the stigma of past sensationalism could be wiped out only by a new organization, in 1844 formed the American Protestant Society to take the place of the Protestant Reformation Society. This new body, by promising a labor of "light and love . . . for the salvation of Romanists," won the endorsement of nearly all Protestant sects and influenced hundreds of clergymen to deliver antipapal sermons. Its methods proved so successful that in 1849 a merger was effected with two lesser anti-Catholic organizations, the Foreign Evangelical Society and the Christian Alliance, to form the most important of the pre-Civil War societies, the American and Foreign Christian Union, pledged to win both the United States and Europe to Protestantism.

The propaganda machinery created by these organized efforts, combined with the heavy immigration from famine-stricken Ireland and Germany, so alarmed Americans that political nativism seemed again feasible. The Compromise of 1850⁹⁹, apparently settling the slavery question for all time, opened the way for the Know-Nothing, or American, party⁹⁹, which enjoyed remarkable success in 1854 and 1855, carrying a number of states and threatening to sweep the nation in the presidential election of 1856. Its brief career was abruptly halted by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act⁹⁹, for as Americans became absorbed in the slavery conflict they forgot their nebulous fears of Rome, and the Civil War doomed both the Know-Nothing party and the American and Foreign Christian Union to speedy extinction.

After the war the nation's attention was so centered on the problems of reconstruction⁹⁹ and economic rehabilitation that nativistic sentiments remained dormant until the 1880's. By this time mounting foreign immigration and unsettled industrial conditions had created a state of mind receptive to antialien propaganda. Instead of being directed against the foreigner, however, this propaganda was again aimed almost exclusively at the Catholic Church. A "Committee of One Hundred" from Boston flooded the country with anti-Catholic documents, newspapers bent on exposing the errors of Rome were founded, and an alleged "Papal Bull" calling for the massacre of all Protestants "on or about the feast of St. Ignatius in the Year of our Lord, 1893" was widely circulated and believed. The American Protective Association⁹⁹, formed in 1887 to crystallize these prejudices, although pledging its

members neither to vote for nor employ Catholics, scarcely mentioned Protestant aliens, indicating that religion and not birthplace was the point of objection.

The political failure of the American Protective Association combined with the interest aroused by the Free Silver[™] campaign of 1896 to check nativistic agitation. In the years after 1898 there was another brief flurry occasioned by the continuing immigration and two events that centered attention on the Church: the celebration of the centenary of the erection of the diocese of Baltimore into a metropolitan see and the meeting in Chicago of the first American Catholic Missionary Conference. This resulted in the inevitable formation of anti-Catholic organizations. Most prominent were the Guardians of Liberty, the Knights of Luther, the Covenanters and the American Pathfinders. No-Popery newspapers, led by the *Menace*, began to appear, but before this phase of the movement could be translated into politics the World War intervened.

The next burst of nativistic excitement occurred during the 1920's. The United States, in the restless period which followed the war, developed an intense nationalism which bred antagonism toward immigrants, Communists and Catholics—toward all groups that were not conservative, Protestant Americans. During the early part of the decade the Ku Klux Klan[™] shaped and fostered this prejudice. The Klan's excesses and political corruption brought about its decline, but intolerance did not abate—a fact clearly shown by the presidential campaign of 1928[™]. The presence of Alfred E. Smith, a Catholic, as the Democratic candidate aroused a bitter nativistic propaganda which was an important factor in causing his defeat.

Since 1929 the depression and administrative steps toward recovery have monopolized national attention and driven nativistic feeling, if not from existence, at least below the surface.

[Michael Williams, *The Shadow of the Pope*; Reuben Maury, *The Wars of the Godly*; Ray A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade*.]

RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON

Natural Bridge of Virginia, first mentioned by Burnaby, an English traveler, was included in a grant of 157 acres made by George III to Thomas Jefferson in 1774. Jefferson placed a log cabin there in 1802 to shelter visitors, and the first hotel was erected in 1815. The Jefferson estate sold the property in 1833.

[Chester Albert Reed, *The Natural Bridge of Virginia*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Natural Resources, Conservation of. See Conservation Movement, The.

Natural Rights are deemed to be those which inhere in the individual anterior to the creation of government and which are not relinquished upon entrance into civil society. The concept was brought to the American colonies through the writings of John Locke[™] and was stated in the New York assembly as early as 1714 by John Mulford. It was developed by the dissenting clergy in New England and became a part of the revolutionary philosophy. Samuel Adams conceived natural rights to be guaranteed by the British constitution[™], but the radical Thomas Paine thought they existed independently of charters and constitutions (*see* Rights of Man). His conception of popular sovereignty involved the basic notion that rights inhere in the individual, and governments exist only for the further protection of individual rights. This idea was in the mind of Jefferson when he wrote into the Declaration of Independence[™] that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," to secure which governments were instituted. Among these rights are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." From the revolutionary philosophy the idea was embodied in the state constitutions with some changes in phraseology (*see* Compact Theory, The).

Both Hamilton and Jefferson subscribed to the doctrine of natural rights, but neither permitted speculative theories to interfere with practical statesmanship. The first attack upon natural rights came in the slavery controversy when Dr. Cooper of South Carolina repudiated the doctrine as a fabrication "by theoretical writers on a contemplation of what might usefully be acknowledged among men as binding on each other." There are no rights, he maintained, except those which society considers it expedient to grant. He was followed by Calhoun[™], who rejected the individualistic political theory of the earlier centuries. In his opinion, government was not a matter of choice but was a fundamental necessity to the existence of man. It was therefore fallacious to assume a state of society anterior to the creation of government and from this attempt to rationalize the formation of political institutions. Thus the whole theory of natural rights appeared to him to be worthless when its foundations were proved to be unsound. Not all of the defenders of slavery, however, were willing to relinquish the doctrine of natural rights. But those who relied upon the doctrine gave it an interpretation which obviated any objection to slaveholding.

Since the Civil War, political theory in the United States, as elsewhere, has not adhered to individuality before organization. Recent ten-

encies, reflected in the writings of Burgess and Willoughby, hold that natural rights have, at most, ethical significance and have no place in political science. However, the doctrine is asserted occasionally in judicial decisions as a basis for the protection of the individual against what is deemed to be the arbitrary action of government.

[D. G. Ritchie, *Natural Rights: A Criticism of Some Political and Ethical Conceptions*.]

WILLIAM S. CARPENTER

Naturalization. Citizenship in the United States is acquired either by birth or by naturalization. Naturalization may be viewed as the formal and legal adoption of an alien into membership in a political community. Under English practice, as late as the 19th century, naturalization came only through special acts of Parliament. But the American colonial assemblies⁹⁰, subject to frequent interferences from Parliament, exercised a limited right to admit to citizenship certain individuals and classes of persons. Upon achieving independence, the states found themselves free to determine their own conditions for citizenship. A few years later, however, in view of the great diversity of state legislation on the subject, it was written into the Constitution (Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 4) that Congress should have power "To establish a uniform rule of naturalization." The Supreme Court at first ventured the opinion that the power to naturalize was concurrent with the Federal and state governments, but presently, in *Chirac v. Chirac* (1817), it ruled that this authority rested exclusively with Congress.

Collective naturalization may be conferred in several ways—by treaty, by statute, or by joint resolution of the two houses of Congress. In several instances, noteworthy among them being the Louisiana Purchase, Florida, the Mexican cessions and Alaska⁹¹, it was incorporated into the treaties of acquisition that the inhabitants, in whole or in part, should be admitted to the American body politic. The Texans (*see* Texas, Annexation of), however, received American citizenship through a joint resolution of Congress (1845). By statutes, citizenship was later bestowed upon the native Hawaiians (1900), the Puerto Ricans (1917) and the American Indians (1924). The Filipinos, never conceded full American citizenship, were nevertheless accorded the status of "nationals," under which they enjoyed the protection of the United States.

These collective methods of naturalization are all legislative in character. They rest upon general acts, without the issue of formal citizenship papers. The naturalization of individuals, on the

other hand, is judicial in character. It is conducted either in the Federal or in the state courts, each person becoming a case for investigation and hearing. At present the Department of Labor co-operates with the courts, assisting the alien candidate to make his application and preparing him for examination. Citizenship papers may be granted by district and territorial courts of the United States, and by "all courts of record in any State or Territory now existing, or which may hereafter be created, having a seal, a clerk, and jurisdiction in actions at law or equity, or law and equity, in which the amount in controversy is unlimited." The law of 1906 is known as the "basic naturalization statute," although it has been qualified by subsequent legislation. It provides that the process of naturalization begin with a "declaration of intention," which may be made as early as the age of eighteen, and immediately upon the arrival of the alien in the United States. In this declaration the applicant renounces all allegiance to "foreign prince, potentate, State or sovereignty." The next step, which may be taken not less than two nor more than seven years later, is to file a petition setting forth certain desired information about the applicant. The petition must be supported by the testimony of two witnesses that to their knowledge the declarant has been a resident of the United States during the five years next preceding, and that he is a person of good moral character. Since 1906, moreover, the declarant has been required to present a certificate showing the date, place and means of his entrance into this country. Three months after the filing of the petition the court will be ready to grant its hearing, unless perchance an election should be due within thirty days, in which event the hearing will be deferred until after the election. When the time arrives, the applicant is questioned, with a view to determining his qualifications and fitness for citizenship. The judge being satisfied, the oath of allegiance will be administered, the affiant pledging himself to "support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States." Thereupon he receives his final papers.

By the highly controverted law of 1875, still in effect, only free white persons and persons of African nativity or descent may be naturalized. Anarchists and polygamists are ineligible. The grant of citizenship papers to the parent constitutes naturalization of all his minor children at that time resident within the United States. Down to recent date our Government followed the foreign practice whereby a married woman took, automatically, the nationality of her husband. But in 1922 the Cable Law was enacted,

completely changing the situation. No woman can now gain American citizenship through marriage to an American. But a foreign woman whose husband is an American citizen may be naturalized without being required to make the declaration of intention, and for her the residence requirement is only one year.

[L. Gettys, *The Law of Citizenship in the United States*; C. H. Maxson, *Citizenship*.]

ROBERT PHILLIPS

Nautilus, a "diving boat," armed with a torpedo, designed and built at Rouen, France, by Robert Fulton, was launched July 24, 1800. After several successful submersions, Fulton submitted his plans for submarine operations against England's navy to Napoleon, who advanced 10,000 francs for repairs and improvements to the *Nautilus*. Though Fulton blew up a French sloop with her at Brest, Aug. 11, 1801, he dismantled her when Napoleon offered no further encouragement.

[H. W. Dickinson, *Robert Fulton, Engineer and Artist*; W. B. Parsons, *Robert Fulton and the Submarine*.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Nauvoo, Mormons at (1839-46). In 1839, upon their expulsion from Missouri, the Mormons⁹⁹, or Latter-day Saints, purchased the embryonic town of Commerce in Hancock County, Ill., changed its name to Nauvoo, and prepared to make it the capital of their faith. The city grew rapidly, attracting Mormons from the East and converts from Europe, especially England. Figures are unreliable, but its population was at least 12,000 in 1845, which was larger than any other city in Illinois at the time.

Nauvoo seemed also to be prosperous. Evidences of wealth were the temple, begun in 1841 and completed five years later at a cost of \$1,000,000, the Nauvoo House and other pretentious structures. But the prosperity was hollow, being dependent principally upon the money brought to the community by the ever-growing stream of newcomers. By 1845 poverty was widespread, and if the exodus forced by the Mormon War⁹⁹ had not taken place, economic collapse probably would have occurred.

[W. A. Linn, *The Story of the Mormons*; T. C. Pease, *The Frontier State, 1818-1848*.]

PAUL M. ANGLE

Navaho, THE, one of the most important tribes now resident in the United States, so adapted themselves to the American occupation as to escape the usual prolonged hostilities and consequent loss of their land and property. At the outbreak of the Mexican War some 7000 of them living in Arizona and New Mexico subsisted by

primitive agriculture, sheep raising and pillaging the Mexicans.

Following the occupation of Santa Fé by American troops in 1846, Col. Alexander Doniphan concluded a treaty with near-by Navaho tribes, binding them to peaceful relations with Mexicans, Pueblos and Americans. This agreement was promptly ignored by the Navaho and a second military expedition under Col. John W. Washington penetrated to their famous stronghold, the Canyon de Chelly, in 1849 and another treaty was drawn by which the Navaho acknowledged the sovereignty of the United States. This treaty was also ignored by the Navaho, particularly after the outbreak of the Civil War, and in 1863 Col. Kit Carson was ordered to punish them until resistance was destroyed. This he did in a brief campaign during which he invaded the Canyon de Chelly, inflicting such severe loss on the Indians that they came, as ordered, to Fort Sumner at the Bosque Redondo⁹⁹. There they were retained as prisoners until 1867 when they were returned to their own country and given new flocks and herds. Since then they have been at peace and are among the most prosperous of Indian tribes. Their number has increased to over 30,000 and their blankets and silver ornaments are standard articles of commerce.

[D. and M. R. Coolidge, *The Navajo Indians*; E. L. Sabin, *Kit Carson Days*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Naval Academy, The United States (founded Oct. 10, 1845, at Annapolis, Md.), is the institution where American naval officers receive their education for active service. In the half century previous to its founding, acting midshipmen on receiving their warrants, usually at a tender age, had reported aboard ship where they obtained a kind of irregular instruction from officers, chaplains and naval schoolmasters, with perhaps some months' leave granted at the time when they were studying for their first commission. John Paul Jones even during the War of the Revolution had suggested the need of systematized instruction. Matthew Fontaine Maury in 1840 had urged that a school be provided. But it was George Bancroft, the historian, who soon after entering upon office as Secretary of the Navy established the "Naval School." On securing, with the approval of the President, the transfer of Fort Severn, Annapolis, from the War Department, he went ahead without asking for an appropriation or authorization from Congress. Commander Franklin Buchanan was the first superintendent. The next year, however, when the establishment of the school was an accomplished

fact, Congress on being asked made the desired appropriation "for repairs, improvements, and instruction at Fort Severn, Annapolis, Md.," and thus recognized its existence. In 1850 its name was changed to the United States Naval Academy, and in 1851 a course of study for four consecutive years was established.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, Annapolis being dangerously near the fighting lines, the schoolship *Constitution* took on board the few remaining midshipmen, the academic records, and equipment, and sailed to Newport, R. I. There the Academy continued to function until 1865. Then returning to the place of its founding, with Admiral David D. Porter as superintendent, it began life anew on a much broader basis. "New Quarters," which were to serve as the midshipmen's dormitory for the next thirty or forty years, a more advanced curriculum, athletic sports and amateur dramatics, all quickly followed.

Similarly, after the Spanish-American War, the Naval Academy again came to public notice. Its buildings were obsolete, and entirely new structures on a much larger scale were required for the rapidly expanding navy. Congress made the necessary appropriation, and thus the present imposing group, Bancroft Hall (the largest dormitory in the world), the lofty chapel, and the massive buildings devoted to the study of seamanship, navigation, ordnance, engineering, mathematics, English and languages came into existence.

The student body represents every state in the Union, with 4 appointees for each member of Congress, 50 from the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, 100 from the enlisted personnel of the Navy and the Marine Corps, and 15 nominated by the President. Before candidates are admitted as midshipmen they must meet the rather rigid mental and physical requirements for entrance. As they are naval officers in a qualified sense, their pay begins on taking the oath, \$780 a year with 75 cents a day for rations. This is sufficient for ordinary expenses, with a small amount remaining for spending money and travel. The enrollment at the present time (1939) is about 2300. Midshipmen are organized as a regiment with twelve companies. Although there is always a commissioned officer present at formations, drills and parades, it is the midshipman regimental officers who are in command. The Naval Academy is known for the precision and smartness of the regiment in drills and military formations, and for the excellent form and bearing of midshipmen in social affairs. The dress parades in "June Week" and the

hops at various times throughout the year always impress visitors by their color.

The four years' course of instruction in most features is like that of the leading technological schools, except that in addition to scientific and cultural studies there are technical courses relating especially to the sea and the profession of the naval officer, and these naturally receive the most emphasis. Instruction during the summer is chiefly in practical work, two of the summers being devoted to practice cruises in battleships of the fleet, commonly to Europe. Graduates, having been awarded the degree of B S., are nearly all given revocable commissions as ensigns in the navy. A limited number are commissioned second lieutenants in the Marine Corps²⁷.

[P. Benjamin, *The United States Naval Academy*; K. Banning, *Annapolis Today*.]

CARROLL S. ALDEN

Naval Armistice Commission, THE (1918-19), composed of representatives of the European Allies, the United States and Japan, visited Germany after the Armistice²⁸ to make sure she had carried out the naval terms of the Treaty of Versailles²⁹. The Commission went to Wilhelmshaven at the end of November, 1918, in H.M.S. *Hercules*, and later to Kiel, spending three weeks in Germany. Although the new republican German government would have preferred to have had the inspection later, it guaranteed and secured protection of the commissioners from attack. The German officers who escorted them were not free agents, for the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils were in control of the navy, and the latter's representatives, wearing white armbands, followed them everywhere, but were not unfriendly although not recognized by the Commission. By Dec. 18 the Commission had completed its work, had arranged for the surrender of submarines under construction, the delivery of the *Baden* in place of the *Mackenzien*, and for future visits. It reported to the Peace Conference³⁰ that the naval terms had been fulfilled as far as was reasonably possible.

[Lewis R. Freeman, *To Kiel in the Hercules*.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Naval Competition, by the United States, began when interference with her trade by both Germany and Great Britain caused the enactment of the so-called Plan of 1916. This called for the construction of 168 warships, 10 of them battleships and 6 battle cruisers. By 1923 the United States would have had a navy stronger than Britain's. Japan's 1920 program surpassed even this.

By the Washington Conference of 1922³¹ the powers abandoned their ambitious plans and

proclaimed a naval holiday of ten years in building capital ships, except replacements (*see* Nine-Power Pact). The United States accepted parity with Great Britain, but because of her position on two oceans insisted on a 10.6 superiority over Japan. Competition thereupon broke out in other types of ships, especially cruisers. Between 1922 and 1928 Japan laid the keels of 16, Great Britain 15, France and the United States 8, and Italy 6. In destroyers the figures ran—France 41, Japan 39, Italy 29, Great Britain 11, and the United States 0; in submarines, France laid down 49, Japan 31, Italy 25, Great Britain 9, and the United States 3 (House of Representatives, *Hearings on 1936 Naval Appropriation Bill*, p. 78, Table VI). Great Britain even wished to increase her cruisers to 70, which would have given her control of the wartime trade of belligerents and neutrals alike.

Upon the failure of the Geneva Three-Power Naval Conference²⁷, the Butler Bill for 71 new ships was introduced in Congress, but although the construction of 15 cruisers and 1 aircraft carrier was authorized in 1929, President Hoover delayed laying their keels. In the London Naval Treaty of 1930²⁸ the number of large cruisers was set at 18 for the United States, 15 for Great Britain and 12 for Japan. Italy and France refused to ratify the whole treaty and could thus build as many noncapital ships as they wished. As to replacements in capital ships the five governments agreed to a naval holiday until 1936.

The United States did not, however, during the years between 1930 and 1934, exercise its right to a "treaty navy," and as a result in 1934, when Japan announced she would not renew the 1922 treaty on Dec. 31, 1936, when the London Treaty also expired, the United States found herself inferior to Japan in small cruisers, destroyers and submarines, and only slightly superior in large cruisers. She thereupon increased her building pace by authorizing increases to treaty strength. At the same time, at the London Naval Conference of 1935, she urged limitation, and joined with France and Great Britain in qualitative restrictions on all classes of ships (*see* London Naval Treaty of 1936). Japan refused to participate further when her demand for full equality was denied. In 1938 she also refused to give assurance that she was not building larger battleships than the treaty allowed the signatories, whereupon they invoked the "escalator" clause²⁹ but announced certain limits they would observe. In the United States, Congress authorized an increase of the navy of 20% but made appropriations for only a part of this addition to our naval power.

[B. H. Williams, *The United States and Disarmament*; U. S. Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, *Hearings on H. R. Bill No. 9218*, 1938]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Naval Home, THE, at Philadelphia was begun in 1826, to serve jointly as a general hospital and an asylum for veteran naval seamen. Costs were defrayed from the pension fund contributed by naval personnel since 1799. The first superintendent was Lt. James B. Cooper, succeeded by Commodore James Biddle as governor in 1838. It was also used as a school for midshipmen 1839-45. In 1842 Lt. (afterward Rear Admiral) A. H. Foote induced most of the veterans to sign a temperance pledge, initiating a movement resulting in abolishing grog in the navy in 1862. After the Civil War hospitalization was restricted to veteran inmates of the asylum. The name was changed to "Home" in 1889. Its capacity is about 240. Naval veterans are also eligible to enter Army Homes.

[C. H. Stockton, *Origin, History, Laws and Regulations of the U. S. Naval Asylum*.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Naval Limitation Conferences. *See* Great Lakes, Agreement for Disarmament on the; Hague Peace Conferences; Fourteen Points; Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, 1921-22; Washington, Naval Treaty of, 1922; Geneva Three-Power Naval Conference, 1927; London Naval Treaty of 1930; London Naval Treaty of 1936.

Naval Observatory, The United States, has been located since 1893 on an elevated site in the city of Washington, D. C. It is a logical outgrowth of the Depot of Charts and Instruments created by order of the Secretary of the Navy in 1830. In 1866 it was separated from the Hydrographic Office, and since that time has been a branch of the Bureau of Navigation except for the period from 1889 to 1910 when it was attached to the Bureau of Equipment. An important department of the Naval Observatory is the Nautical Almanac Office which was created in 1849 and was a separate unit of the Bureau of Navigation from 1858 to 1894. The chief functions of the Naval Observatory are: (1) to furnish the correct daily time by radio signals; (2) to maintain continuous observations of the heavenly bodies for position and time; (3) to compute and prepare for publication the *American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac*; and (4) to develop, maintain, repair, inspect and supply navigational, aeronautical and aerological instruments for naval vessels and aircraft.

[G. A. Weber, *The Naval Observatory*.]

NELSON M. BLAKE

Naval Oil Reserves were suggested to President Taft by Secretary of the Interior R. A. Ballinger in September, 1909, and after the necessary legislation had been passed the President permanently withdrew from entry Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 (Elk Hills) on Sept. 2, 1912, No. 2 (Buena Vista, Calif.) on Dec. 13, 1912, and No. 3 (Teapot Dome) April 30, 1915, altogether involving about 50,000 acres of public land. Less than a tenth of the total area withdrawn from entry was free of pending prior claims, and though Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, in his report to President Wilson on Dec. 1, 1913, urged the passage of legislation permitting the Navy Department to take possession of the reserves, drill wells, erect refineries and produce its own supply of fuel oil, such permission was not given. The reserves lay dormant until 1920 when an act of Congress authorized the Navy Department to take possession of that part of the reserves against which no claims were pending, to develop them, and to use, store and exchange the products therefrom. It had become evident, meanwhile, that petroleum beneath the withdrawn area was probably being drained away through wells on adjoining land, and some leases for protective drilling were given during the few months Secretary Daniels remained in office. Edwin Denby, who became Secretary of the Navy under President Harding, requested early in 1921 that the custody of the Naval Petroleum Reserves be transferred to the Interior Department, which had not only been engaged in producing heliumsm for the Navy Department, but was the official agency for settling claims to public land. The power to determine general policy in regard to the reserves remained with the Navy Department, and it was at the suggestion of the latter that it was eventually determined to lease the Elk Hills and Teapot Dome reserves as a unit, exchanging the royalty oil not only for fuel oil, but for storage facilities at Pearl Harborsm, Hawaii, and other strategic points. This was done in comparative secrecy, imposed by the Navy Department on the grounds that the action taken was part of its war plans, but early in 1922 it came to the attention of the Senate, which began an investigation. This, continuing with interruptions, for several years, was, in part at least, an attempt to discredit the Republican administration. In this it was extremely successful; it was disclosed that Secretary of the Interior Fall had received \$100,000 from the president of the company that had leased Elk Hills and had engaged in involved financial dealings with the president of the company that leased Teapot Domesm. Through the

ensuing litigation the leases were cancelled and Secretary Fall was convicted on a charge of bribery, but the others were acquitted.

[Hearings pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 282, beginning Oct. 22, 1923.]

T. T. READ

Naval Operations, The Chief of, has responsibility under the Secretary of the Navy for the operations of the fleet and for the preparation and readiness of its war plans. Urged by Admiral Bradley A. Fiske, Congress created the office in 1915 for the co-ordination of Navy Departmentsm branches in the above respects, similar to General Staffsm practices. The first appointee was Admiral William S. Benson. In 1916 the rank of this official was elevated to "Admiral."

[E. W. Eberle, *The Office of Naval Operations, U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, November, 1927.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Naval Ordnance. Our first nondescript naval ordnance—cast-iron muzzle-loading, smooth-bore guns on wooden carriages—ranged from 18-pounders to hand weapons—muskets, pistols, hand grenades, pikes and cutlasses.

Servicing the gun—sponging, loading, returning to battery by gun tackles after recoil checked by breechings, elevating by handspike, training by sighting over gun (employing gun tackles), and igniting black-powder charge with priming quill to touchhole—was performed by hand.

Radical improvements came with the appearance of the rifled, breech-loading gun and the ironclad (Monitor typesm).

Today's armaments include: hand weapons, small- and medium-calibered guns for torpedo and aircraft defense batteries (including landing operations), ranging to 16-inch guns mounted in turrets, with ranges exceeding 35,000 yards whose fire is controlled from protected stations aloft and below (aided by aircraft observation)—all operations of loading, aiming and firing performed by electrical machinery; armor for ships' sides and decks, sights for firing guns and torpedoes from various types of craft; all-purpose radio and aircraft; smokeless powder, apparatus for laying mines and launching gas attacks; protective measures against mines (paravanes) and gas, and damage from hits by air, mine, torpedo and gun; searchlights and special shells for night engagements.

HARRY A. BALDRIDGE

Naval Reserves. State organizations of naval militia, first by Massachusetts in 1890, were succeeded in 1916 by a Federal naval reserve of six classes. During the Spanish-American War, Massachusetts, New York, Michigan and Maryland

militia manned respectively the auxiliary cruisers *Prairie*, *Yankee*, *Yosemite* and *Dixie*. New Jersey militia manned the *Badger* and *Resolute*, while Illinois and other militia manned ninety-nine small vessels. During the World War nearly 22,000 reserve officers and 272,000 men were distributed at large among regulars on all types of ships and shore stations. In 1925 the number of naval reserve classes was reduced to three, comprising the Fleet Naval Reserve composed mostly of ex-service men, the Merchant Marine[®] Naval Reserve, and the Volunteer Naval Reserve. Two classes of Marine Corps[®] Reserves were also created. The Fleet Reserve was organized into 149 divisions at 89 places in the United States. College Training Units for Reserve Officers were established at Harvard, Yale, Georgia School of Technology, Northwestern University and the Universities of California and Washington. The Naval Reserve Act of 1938 revised the classifications (a) "Fleet Reserve" of ex-regular officers and men, (b) "Organized Reserve" comprising actively drilling units, (c) "Merchant Marine Reserve" of officers and men connected with the seafaring profession, and (d) "Volunteer Reserve" comprising various technicians. The aviation division is a unit of the Naval Reserve aeronautical division.

[Navy Department, *Official Documents*.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Naval Stores. The origin of the term "naval stores" as applied to pine products dates back to the 17th century (*see* King's Woods), when an increase in European trade augmented the demand for tar and pitch, which Sweden alone was then able to supply. To make herself independent of the Swedish monopoly, as well as to check other manufactures in her American colonies, Parliament, in 1704, began to offer substantial bounties for colonial naval stores. Special efforts were made to promote their production in the Northern colonies, but with meager success (*see* Palatines). By 1720 the long-leaved pine section of North Carolina had become the chief producer of these stores. Of the naval stores exported from the colonies to Great Britain, North Carolina furnished seven tenths of the tar, one fifth of the pitch and over one half of the turpentine[®], the colony's total annual shipments amounting to £42,000.

With the loss of the British bounty[®] at the time of the American Revolution, the industry suffered a temporary decline. In the second quarter of the 19th century, however, it began to grow rapidly and to expand southward. Turpentine had now become the leading "naval

store," and for more than a half century its production was North Carolina's chief industry. In 1840 the Carolinas produced almost 100% of the nation's supply; in 1860 they produced 60% of the total; in 1890 Georgia led; since 1905 Florida has been the chief producer, followed, in order, by Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama and Texas. Today, the Carolinas produce less than one half of 1% of the nation's naval stores. Since 1900 the products of the industry have never been less than \$10,000,000 a year, and in 1919 they reached \$30,000,000. Naval stores, chiefly turpentine and rosin, are now used largely in the manufacture of paint, varnish, disinfectants, soap, shoe polish, lubricants, linoleum and roofing material. Savannah is the leading port of shipment.

[Thomas W. Gamble, ed., *Naval Stores: History, Production, Distribution and Consumption*.]

HUGH T. LEFLER

Naval War College. THE, was established at Coaster's Harbor Island, near Newport, R. I., in 1884, largely through the advocacy of Commodore Stephen B. Luce, its first president. It was the first institution of its kind in the world. A regular curriculum and the applicatory system of instruction were inaugurated in 1911. A junior class was established in 1914 and an advanced class in 1934. The primary purpose of the college is the education and training of officers in the higher branches of naval warfare. In 1939 the faculty comprised twenty-four officers and there were seventy students.

[J. T. G. Stapler, *The Naval War College, U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, August, 1932.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Naval War with France. In consequence of the Franco-American misunderstanding of 1798-1800[®] the French, with no declaration of war, began to seize or plunder American merchant vessels. Despite our attempts to settle the matter diplomatically no solution could be reached. In March-July, 1798, Congress passed acts empowering our merchant marine[®] to "repel by force any assault"; commissioning privateers[®]; and ordering our navy to seize all armed French craft on our coast, or molesting our trade. Washington was recalled from retirement and appointed commander in chief of the army. Our three-ship navy was rapidly enlarged by construction, purchase and gifts to fifty-five vessels. The first got to sea May 24, 1798. France, occupied with European wars and knowing the weakness of our untrained navy, sent no heavy vessels to the western Atlantic, but placed her reliance on privateers supported by a few frigates and sloops of war.

As our vessels were commissioned, they were organized into small squadrons to guard the chief trade areas in the East and West Indies with single vessels detailed to convoy duty. Aside from numerous actions with privateers, the only engagements, each an American victory, were between the *Insurgente*, 40 guns, and the *Constellation*⁹⁰, 36; the *Vengeance*, 50, and the *Constellation*, 36; and the *Berceau*, 24, and the *Boston*⁹¹, 32. Capt. Thomas Truxtun, commander of the *Constellation* in both engagements, was presented with two gold medals by Congress. Two vessels, the schooners *Enterprise*⁹² and *Experiment*, had especially notable careers, the former taking thirteen prizes on one cruise. No attempts to seize the French islands were made, but Capt. Henry Geddes with the ship *Patapsco* on Sept. 23, 1800, successfully dislodged the French forces which had taken possession of the Dutch island of Curaçao. About eighty-five French vessels were captured, not including recaptures of American craft and small boats; the French took one American naval vessel, the schooner *Retaliation*, ex-*LaCroyable*, the first American capture in the war. However, several hundred American merchant vessels were seized by France both abroad and in home waters. These were condemned at farcical admiralty trials, the crews in most instances being imprisoned and brutally treated.

On Sept. 30, 1800, a "Convention of Peace, Commerce and Navigation" was concluded, and shortly thereafter hostilities ceased (*see* Convention of 1800). Claims arising from France's failure to meet her obligations under this treaty helped bring about the purchase of Louisiana⁹³. (*See also* French Spoliation Claims.)

[G. W. Allen, *Our Naval War with France.*]

MARION V. BREWINGTON

Navigation Act of 1817. The movement toward national self-sufficiency which followed the War of 1812 was manifested in the Tariff of 1816 and the Navigation Act of 1817. The latter was not different in spirit from earlier British and Federal commercial regulations (*see* Coasting Trade). The act of 1817 stated that all cargo between American ports must be carried in ships entirely owned by American citizens. Tonnage duties on vessels licensed for coastwise trade were six cents a ton on vessels manned by Americans, and fifty cents for others. Since 1817 the policy of excluding all but American ships from the coasting trade has remained unchanged.

[Emory R. Johnson, T. W. Van Metre, G. G. Huebner, D. S. Hanchett, *History of Domestic and Foreign Commerce of the United States.*]

JOHN HASKELL KEMBLE

Navigation Acts, THE, had their origin in the British regulations of the coastwise trade. When colonies developed overseas an extension of the coastwise regulations followed. The first formal legislation affecting the colonies was enacted by Parliament in 1649 and 1651. These laws were modified, consolidated and re-enacted in 1660 and became the basic Navigation Act. This law and others were revised in the final act of 1696. The object was to protect British shipping against competition from Dutch and other foreign seamen. Under these acts no goods could be imported into or exported from any British colony in Asia, Africa or America except in English vessels, English-owned, and with crews three-fourths English. Other clauses limited the importation of any products of Asia, Africa or America into England to English vessels and provided that goods from foreign countries could be imported into England only in vessels from such foreign countries or in English ships.

Wherever the word English was used in these and subsequent acts it referred to the nationality of individuals and not to their place of residence. Thus American colonists were just as much English as their compatriots who resided in London. The net effect of these basic laws was to give Englishmen and English ships a legal monopoly of all trade between various colonial ports and between colonial ports and England. Even the trade between colonial ports and foreign countries was limited to English vessels. Thus foreign vessels were excluded entirely from colonial ports and could trade only at ports in the British Isles.

Another field of legislation had to do with commodities. Certain important colonial products were enumerated and could be exported from the place of production only to another British colony or to England. At first this list included tobacco, sugar, indigo, cotton wool, ginger, fustic and other dyewoods. Later, enumeration was extended to naval stores, hemp, rice, molasses, beaver skins, furs, copper ore, iron and lumber.

Asiatic goods and European manufactures could be imported into the colonies only from England. An exception was made in the case of salt or wine from the Azores or the Madeira Islands, and food products from Ireland or Scotland.

The enumerated clauses of the Navigation Acts were enforced by a system of bonds which required the master of the vessel to comply with the provisions of the acts. These operated in such a way as to give American shipowners a practical monopoly of the trade between the

continental and West Indian colonies. Residents of Great Britain in turn had a general monopoly of the carrying of the heavy enumerated goods from the colonies to the British Isles.

Closely related to the Navigation Acts was another series of measures called "Trade Acts," and usually confused with the Navigation Acts proper. These were enacted mostly after 1700 and gradually developed into a most complicated system of trade control and encouragement. The general plan was to make the entire British Empire prosperous and the trade of one section complementary to that of other sections.

Colonists were largely limited to buying British manufactures. This was not necessarily a disadvantage, because an elaborate system of export bounties was provided so that British goods were actually cheaper in the colonies than similar foreign goods. These bounties⁷⁷ averaged more than £38,000 per year for the ten years preceding the Revolution. From 1757 to 1770 the bounties on British linens, exported to the colonies, totaled £346,232 according to the British treasury reports. Added to this was a series of rebates or drawbacks of duties on European goods exported to the colonies. These, too, ran into formidable sums. Those to the West Indies alone amounted to £34,000 in 1774. The average payments from the British treasury in bounties and drawbacks on exports to the colonies in 1764 amounted to about £250,000 sterling per year.

Colonial production of articles desired in the British markets was encouraged by a variety of measures. Colonial tobacco⁷⁸ was given a complete monopoly of the home market by prohibiting its growth in England and placing very heavy import duties on the competing Spanish tobacco. Other colonial products were encouraged by tariff duties, so levied as to discriminate sharply in favor of the colonial product and against the competing foreign product. Some colonial products, not fully needed in England, were given rebates on re-exportation so as to facilitate their flow through the British markets to their foreign destinations. In other cases surplus colonial products, like rice⁷⁹, were permitted to be exported directly to foreign colonies and to southern Europe without passing through England. In still other cases colonial products such as hemp, indigo, lumber and silk were paid direct cash bounties on arrival in England. These alone totaled more than £82,000 from 1771 to 1775. Naval stores⁸⁰ also received liberal bounties, totaling £1,438,762 from 1706 to 1774, and at the time of the Revolution were averaging £25,000 annually.

In the main the navigation system was mutually profitable to colonies and mother country. An occasional colonial industry was discouraged by parliamentary prohibition, if it threatened to develop into serious competition with an important home industry. The outstanding illustrations are laws forbidding the intercolonial export of colonial-made hats⁸¹, colonial grown or manufactured wool, and the act forbidding the setting up of new mills for the production of wrought iron and steel. These laws produced some local complaint, although they evidently affected very few people.

So long as the Trade and Navigation laws were limited to the regulation of trade and the promotion of the total commerce of the empire they were generally popular in America; at least that was true after 1700. The attempt to use them as taxation measures was resisted. The enumerated products came largely from the colonies that remained loyal. The bounties went largely to the colonies that revolted. The New England shipping industry rested directly upon the protection of the Navigation Acts. These are among the reasons why the First Continental Congress⁸² in its resolutions approved the navigation system and why Franklin offered to have the acts re-enacted by every colonial legislature in America and to guarantee them for a hundred years, if taxation of America was abandoned.

[The actual operation of the Trade laws must be gathered from the *Treasury Papers* in the British Public Record Office in London. A good general account is George E. Howard, *Preliminaries of the Revolution*.]

O. M. DICKERSON

Navigator, The, a handbook for Western emigrants, with descriptions of river towns, was launched by Zadok Cramer of Pittsburgh about 1801 and went through twelve editions to 1824. The early editions contained directions for navigating the Ohio (including the Allegheny and the Monongahela); later editions gave navigating directions for the Mississippi and descriptions of the Missouri and Columbia rivers. The publication was bought eagerly by emigrants going down the rivers in flatboats⁸³ and was an effective aid to the Western migration.

[C. W. Dahlinger, *Pittsburgh, a Sketch of Its Early Social Life*.]

OLON J. BUCK

Navy, Confederate. See Confederate Navy, The.

Navy, Department of the. The unsatisfactory administration of naval affairs by the War Department⁸⁴ led Congress to create the Department of the Navy in April, 1798, following the recommendation of President John Adams. Ben-

jamin Stoddert of Georgetown, D. C., was appointed the first Secretary of the Navy and directed operations during the Naval War with France^m. Experience during the War of 1812^m demonstrated the need of adequate and responsible professional assistants for the secretary, and in 1815 a Board of Navy Commissioners, consisting of three senior officers, was legally created for this purpose. The first appointees were Commodores Rodgers, Hull and Porter. By the rulings of the new secretary, however, the functions of the board were virtually restricted to naval technology rather than naval operations. In 1842 an organization of technical bureaus was adopted to supersede the Board of Commissioners, and this has since continued to be a main feature of the organization.

The first bureaus to be created were those of (1) Navy Yards and Docks, (2) Construction, Equipment and Repairs, (3) Provisions and Clothing, (4) Ordnance and Hydrography, and (5) Medicine and Surgery. The duties of the bureaus were not performed as a board but separately under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and their orders had full force and effect as emanating from him. In 1862 the five bureaus were supplanted by eight, including one of Steam Engineering. Construction and Repair was separated from Equipment and Recruiting, and Navigation from Ordnance. The Bureau of Equipment was abolished in 1910 and in 1921 the Bureau of Aeronautics established. An Office of the Judge Advocate General, independent of any bureau, was first created in 1865.

The defect of inadequate professional direction over strategy and general operations of the fleet was severely felt in all of the early wars. In the Civil War^m it was minimized by the advice of Mr. Gustavus V. Fox, a former naval officer who was appointed temporary Assistant Secretary of the Navy. This office was created permanently in 1890, but has been usually occupied by civilian appointees with jurisdiction over industrial functions. During the War with Spain^m a temporary board of officers advised the secretary on strategy but had no responsibility or authority respecting fleet operations. In 1900 the secretary appointed a "General Board" of high-ranking officers, that has since remained in existence as an advisory body without executive functions. Meantime the scope and extent of Navy Department activities were growing beyond the possibility of due co-ordination of the bureaus by the office of the secretary. In 1909 Secretary Meyer accordingly appointed four naval officer "aides" to assist him—one each for the functions of Operations, Personnel, Matériel

and Inspections. This functional organization seemed sound and worked well, and has been continued in principle. Secretary Daniels abolished the Aide for Personnel in 1913 but the duties were continued by the Bureau of Navigation. Similarly the function of inspections reverted to a Board of Inspection. Matériel matters passed largely to the jurisdiction of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. The creation by law in 1915 of the Chief of Naval Operations^m served to rectify many previous administrative defects and to further co-ordination within the department. He has authority commensurate with his great responsibilities as the principal advisor of the Secretary of the Navy, and as having charge under the secretary of the operations of the fleet. The Office of Operations has naturally absorbed many of the lesser boards and offices outside the normal province of the bureaus. During the World War^m the new organization gave eminent satisfaction. From early years Marine Corps^m affairs have been handled by a headquarters in the Navy Department.

[A. W. Johnson, *Manuscript History of the Navy Department*.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Navy, Insignia of Rank in. Data during the Revolution are obscure. By regulations of 1797 the style of uniform and the numbers of buttons on sleeves, lapel and pockets indicated variations in rank. Also, captains wore a gold epaulet on each shoulder and lieutenants one epaulet on the right shoulder. Only custom ruled the simple garb of enlisted men until 1841. With the periodic increase in the numbers of ranks and corps came many changes of uniforms and insignia, the principal ones being in 1802, 1813, 1841, 1852, 1861, 1864, 1877, 1897 and 1918. At present the distinguishing mark for commissioned officers of the line is a five-pointed gold star; and of the several staff corps variations of gold oak leaves, excepting a Latin cross for chaplains. These ornaments are worn on sleeves and shoulder equipment. Grades of rank within corps are indicated by number and width of gold stripes on sleeves and by stripes or insignia on shoulder trappings. These insignia virtually duplicate those for the same relative ranks in the Army and Marine Corps. Warrant officers wear distinguishing corps mark on sleeves. Petty officers' ratings are indicated by corps marks and chevrons on sleeves.

[*Uniform Regulations, U. S. Navy.*]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Navy, Peacetime Organization and Activities of the. The navy during times of peace performs many useful and valuable services for the

nation and for mankind. Its officers act as diplomatic agents, its ships are sent on humanitarian errands and its organization is used to promote international good will and peace. Every United States naval officer is an accredited representative when abroad, and in this capacity many have conducted difficult negotiations. In 1826 Capt. Thomas ap Catesby Jones negotiated a treaty with the Hawaiian government; in 1839 Commodore Charles Wilkes made an agreement with Samoan chiefs for the protection of whalers⁷ and traders visiting the islands; Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry⁸ in 1854 made his famous treaty with Japan; Commodore R. W. Shufeldt in 1882 negotiated the first treaty between Korea and a Western power; after the Armistice in 1918 Rear Admiral Mark Bristol was appointed High Commissioner to Turkey, where he co-operated with the Allies in providing homes and employment for 140,000 Russian refugees, and promoted American trade interests; and in 1922 Brig.-Gen. John H. Russell, United States Marine Corps, was appointed High Commissioner to Haiti⁹, where for nearly eight years his services were of signal benefit to that unsettled country. When in 1832 the people of the Loo-Choo Islands were threatened with starvation, the navy's vessels averted the catastrophe by supplying the sufferers with fish and rice; during the Irish famine of 1847 the navy sent two vessels with cargoes of food and clothing for the victims; after the volcanic eruption of Mount Pelée on the island of Martinique in 1902 American naval vessels in the Caribbean were rushed to the scene of disaster with supplies and aided in transporting the inhabitants to places of safety; in 1923 under the supervision of American naval forces in the Mediterranean 262,000 Greeks and Armenians were removed from the strife-torn, burning city of Smyrna; and in the same year American naval destroyers were the first foreign vessels to reach Japan after a great earthquake and tidal wave. They brought medical assistance and supplies and assisted in organizing relief work. During the Mississippi flood of 1927 thirty-two naval planes assisted in the rescue of flood victims. Naval vessels are sent on good-will cruises, such as the visit of the United States fleet to Australia, New Zealand and the South Seas in 1925, the visit of President-elect Herbert Hoover to South America aboard an American cruiser in 1928, and the visit of President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Argentina on the cruiser *Indianapolis* in 1936 (*see* Peace Conference at Buenos Aires). In addition American naval officers are present at every international disarmament conference.

To encourage the manufacture of heavy armor plate, enormous gun forgings and steel castings for navy ships, the Bureau of Ordnance has borne the cost of development of high-power hydraulic pumps, powerful cranes and huge machine-shop tools from which industry as a whole has benefited. The Bureau of Ordnance developed the Waterbury high-speed gear for use in training and elevating guns, a gear now used in steering gears, punch presses, motion-picture machines and textile-printing presses. The navy has also pioneered in the development of steel alloys, machinery lubricants and electrical refrigeration.

Maritime navigation is aided by pilot charts, sailing directions for every ocean, lists of lights, buoys and fixed navigational dangers. These are published by the Hydrographic Office, which also studies ocean currents, and conducts nautical research expeditions. The Naval Observatory¹⁰ twenty times daily broadcasts time signals which establish standard time for the country, and assembles and publishes data concerning solar and lunar eclipses. The Naval Communication Service broadcasts weather forecasts and storm warnings for aviators. Aviation charts are also prepared for the use of air navigators. The navy pioneered in the development of the air-cooled aviation engine, developed the parachute and invented the catapult.

[U. S. Office of Naval Intelligence, *The United States Navy in Peace Time, the Navy in Relation to the Industrial, Scientific, Economic and Political Development of the Nation.*]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Navy in Turkish Waters (1919-23). During the period of confusion in Turkey following the World War, the naval forces of the United States in those waters, consisting of two cruisers and a detachment of destroyers, were commanded by Rear Admiral Mark L. Bristol, who was also appointed to the diplomatic post of High Commissioner at Constantinople on Aug. 12, 1919. These naval vessels efficiently assisted the United States Food Administration¹¹ in distributing relief to southern Russia, Turkey, Roumania and Bulgaria. They also kept open necessary lines of communication, and made possible the continuance in the Near East of American commercial enterprises, schools, hospitals and the Red Cross¹². After the defeat of Gen. Wrangell's forces by the Bolsheviks, Nov. 13-15, 1920, they rescued thousands of Russian fugitives. Destroyers were sent to Beirut the same year to protect the American University and other interests there when the natives threatened an uprising against the French occupation of Syria. Following the crush-

ing defeat of the Greek army of invasion in Asia Minor in 1922, they assisted in the evacuation of thousands from Smyrna. While that city was in flames, on Sept. 24, they made possible the docking of ten Greek ships on which 30,000 women and children were embarked on one day.

[George R. Clark and others, *A Short History of the United States Navy*; *Proceedings* of the U. S. Naval Institute, February and March, 1925; *Reports* of the Secretary of the Navy, 1919-23.]

CHARLES LEE LEWIS

Navy of the United States, THE, came into being principally to meet the acute need of munitions by the Continental army^o. Beginning in September, 1775, Gen. Washington fitted out and armed vessels to prey on British supply ships near Boston. Led by John Adams, the Continental Congress^o first voted naval ships on Oct. 13, 1775. The Continental navy obtained invaluable military supplies through captures, convoy operations and transportation from France and the West Indies. Its depredations on British commerce, augmented by American privateers^o, strongly influenced the British public toward peace. Most notable were the raids on the British coast by Commodore John Paul Jones in 1779, and his capture in the *Bonhomme Richard*^o of the frigate *Serapis*. Commodore John Barry also rendered distinguished services in the frigate *Alliance*^o.

Dying after the Revolution, the navy was reborn in 1794 when Congress provided for building six frigates because of piratical activities against our Mediterranean commerce, as well as depredations by Spanish, British and French vessels elsewhere. In 1798 the Navy Department^o was created and three completed frigates, augmented by revenue cutters and converted merchant vessels, were sent against numerous French privateers then freely capturing American vessels. In an undeclared three-year naval war nearly eighty-five French vessels were captured, including two frigates (*see* Naval War with France). In 1801 a squadron was sent against Tripoli, which had declared war despite our tribute. A series of attacks in 1803 by a strong squadron under Commodore Preble resulted in an honorable peace without tribute, payment of which to Algiers, however, was continued (*see* Barbary Wars). The Jefferson embargo in 1807 and the War of 1812^o postponed until 1816 a satisfactory settlement with Algiers through a naval demonstration (*see* Decatur's Cruise to Algiers).

Meantime, intolerable interference with America's great and essential seaborne commerce and provocative impressment^o of American seamen

brought on the War of 1812. At sea our diminutive navy could only raid British commerce and engage defending men-of-war. Usually successful in this warfare our navy served to stimulate national unity and patriotism that wavered from reverses ashore. The frigate *Constitution*^o became especially distinguished through three brilliant victories. After the first year an overpowering British blockade smothered our coastal operations and essential water transportation.

In military campaigns on the northern frontier the naval factor proved decisive. Commodore Perry's notable victory on Lake Erie^o (Sept. 10, 1813) helped save northern Ohio and states northwestward from permanent British control. Commodore Macdonough's^o defeat of the British squadron on Lake Champlain (Sept. 11, 1814) repulsed invasion by about 12,000 veterans then at Plattsburg^o and saved northern Maine from British annexation. In defending New Orleans^o, shortly after peace had been signed, Commodore Patterson's squadron rendered decisive service.

During the long peace, 1815-61, interrupted only by the Mexican War^o, the navy was active in supporting and expanding seaborne commerce upon which depended national economics. Protecting squadrons were maintained abroad. West Indian piracy^o was eradicated (1816-29). Trade treaties were negotiated with many minor states, such as Siam (1833) and Muscat. Naval diplomacy notably promoted the opening to our commerce of China (1842), Japan (1854) and Korea (1882). The exploring expeditions under Commodore Wilkes^o (1838-42) and Commodores Ringgold^o and Rodgers (1852-56) extensively explored the Pacific Ocean. Wilkes discovered a broad sector of the Antarctic continent. American sea trade was given essential assistance in politically disturbed regions.

Admission of virtually independent Texas to the Union precipitated war with Mexico in 1846. Supposed ambitions of England and France respecting Texas, and of England to take California, hastened our Government's decision. Naval operations on the East coast principally supported the land campaign, notably in blockading, guarding sea transportation, and the joint capture of Vera Cruz^o (March, 1847) and in seizing minor seaports. In California Commodore Sloat took Monterey (July 7, 1846) and Commander Montgomery captured San Francisco. Opposition was stronger about Los Angeles, which was finally taken on Jan. 10, 1847, after an extensive land campaign under Commodore Stockton, whose seamen and marines were augmented by

a small army contingent and the "California Battalion"⁷⁰ of civilian volunteers.

The Civil War's outbreak found the small navy ill-prepared with most active units on foreign stations. One squadron had recently made a demonstration against Paraguay that brought satisfactory terms. The titanic conflict at home called for several naval missions: world-wide protection of merchant shipping against Confederate raiders; blockading⁷¹ the extensive Southern coastline; attacking fortified coastal and river ports; close support of the army in combat operations; safeguarding army communications and preventing foreign intervention in the war.

The Confederate raiders (*see Alabama; Florida; Shenandoah*) made but few captures, yet fear of them caused the transfer of nearly 1,000,000 tons of shipping to foreign registry. The *Alabama* captured sixty-nine prizes in a cruise of eleven months and was much the most successful raider. She was sunk off Cherbourg by the *Kearsarge*⁷² on June 19, 1864.

The unprecedented blockade of its long coastline was disastrous to the Confederacy, crippling the munitioning of its army and ruining Southern finances and economic life by stopping cotton exports. The capture of Confederate seaports supplemented the blockade. Admiral DuPont took Port Royal (November, 1861); Farragut's fleet captured New Orleans (April, 1862) and Mobile Bay (August, 1864); and Admiral Porter's great armada took the Wilmington entrance in co-operation with troops under Gen. Terry (January, 1865)⁷³. Long continued and determined efforts to take Charleston failed. Many lesser ports were captured by the navy.

Another major naval effort was splitting the Confederacy apart on the Mississippi and other Western rivers. Farragut's forces worked upstream from New Orleans, and armored gunboats under Foote, Davis and Porter fought their way downstream in close co-operation with the army. The capture of Vicksburg⁷⁴ (July 4, 1863) completely opened the Mississippi after a campaign of classic military-naval co-ordination between Grant, Farragut and Porter.

Naval operations similarly gave close and effective support to other military campaigns, notably the Peninsular⁷⁵ (1862) and the final one in Virginia (*see Petersburg, Siege of*). Grant was repeatedly halted in 1864 and could force Lee back only by flank marches, made possible through quick shifts of main army bases by naval-controlled water.

After many decades of diplomatic friction respecting Cuba the Spanish-American War⁷⁶ was precipitated by the blowing up of the American

battleship *Maine*⁷⁷ in Havana harbor on Feb. 15, 1898. Crossing the Atlantic, a Spanish fleet under Admiral Cervera reached Santiago where our fleet under Admiral Sampson established a blockade and our army landed and pressed an attack. Cervera's sally on July 3 met with the complete destruction of his fleet after which Santiago capitulated and American attack was transferred to Puerto Rico. In the Orient the squadron under Commodore Dewey ran the batteries defending Manila Bay⁷⁸ and destroyed the Spanish fleet there on May 1. An American army having been sent out, Manila fell under joint military-naval attack, on Aug. 13. After a successful war the United States gave Cuba her freedom but kept Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands⁷⁹, where an insurrection broke out on Feb. 4, 1899, calling for active military-naval operations for nearly two years.

The failure to safeguard American rights at sea through diplomacy alone finally led us to enter the World War⁸⁰ (April 6, 1917). Allied defeat from the German submarine⁸¹ campaign then appeared imminent, but was prevented by the margin of American naval aid. Reinforcements of American destroyers in Europe, commencing May 4, 1917, made possible the adoption of the effective convoy⁸² system of protecting shipping. Another major antisubmarine measure was the mine barrage across the North Sea, laid principally by American vessels. Sub-chasers manned largely by reserve personnel operated offensively against submarines in British waters and the Mediterranean. (*See Northern Mine Barrage.*)

The overseas transportation and supply of the American Army was a problem of first importance and magnitude, especially during the acute crisis of victorious German drives in the spring of 1918. Nearly 2,000,000 American troops furnished the margin of Allied victory. Nearly half crossed the ocean in American naval transports and most of the remainder in British merchant ships escorted by American destroyers. A large organization of supply ships was also operated by our navy. Auxiliary naval effort in the war included large aviation forces in Europe engaged in sea patrols and bombing submarine shore bases; a squadron of battleships to reinforce the British Grand Fleet; submarines operating against hostile submarines; coastal patrols by yachts and other auxiliary craft; a railway battery of long-range naval guns in France; and mid-ocean cruiser escorts for convoys. A few German submarine raids against our home coast called for extensive counter naval operations there. Postwar naval activities of magnitude

were continued in northern Russia, eastern Siberia and the Adriatic Sea until political readjustments could be completed.

The period of 1921-36 saw limitation of navies by international agreement in a proportion of 5-5-3-1.75-1.75, respectively for Britain, America, Japan, France and Italy. Limitation treaties ended with Japanese denouncement previous to their invasion of China proper in 1937. There followed a period of extensive rearmament abroad, specifically because of which President F. D. Roosevelt urged upon Congress substantial additions to our navy. In May, 1938, Congress authorized an expansion by about 20% above the levels previously fixed. In October the President stressed our concern for the security of the Western Hemisphere, virtually in accord with the Monroe Doctrine⁷⁷, as a main reason for increasing our armaments still further. Congress provided for the speeding up of naval construction to the extent of about \$150,000,000 above that previously contemplated. Because of Japan's refusal to exchange information, Britain, France and the United States agreed upon increasing the tonnage limit of battleships from 35,000 to 45,000 each.

[D. W. Knox, *A History of the United States Navy.*]
DUDLEY W. KNOX

Navy Yards for the supply, repair and construction of men-of-war were first established permanently by our Government in 1800 when present sites at Boston, Norfolk, Portsmouth, N. H., and Washington were purchased. Sites were acquired at Brooklyn and Philadelphia in 1801, Pensacola, Fla., in 1825, Mare Island, Calif., in 1854, Charleston, S. C., in 1901 and Puget Sound, Wash., in 1902. Numerous lesser naval stations have been established. The yard at Brooklyn⁷⁸ has grown to be the largest, with Norfolk next. The British navy used the Norfolk site before the Revolution, and the Virginia state navy during that war. It was captured by the British in 1779 but soon evacuated. In April, 1861, the station was fired and abandoned by Federal forces but by extinguishing fires the Confederates saved vast supplies. Cannon thus acquired were the principal source for the Confederate Navy and many forts throughout the South. The yard was recaptured by Federal forces in May, 1862. Facilities have kept pace with the subsequent growth in the number and size of ships, and equipment now exists to dock, repair and construct vessels of the largest size.

For many years the Boston yard was among the largest and forty-two vessels were built there before 1880, but its importance waned with the advent of steam and steel and the increased size

of ships. The same influences have restricted the growth of the Portsmouth yard, now used principally for the construction of submarines⁷⁹. In 1868 the old Philadelphia yard at Federal Street was transferred to League Island which has been extensively developed for constructing steel ships and for laying up de-commissioned vessels. The Washington yard was fired by American forces during the British raid on the capital in 1814 (see Washington Burned). The first chain cable manufactured by the navy was made here in 1829, and the yard was gradually transformed into the principal ordnance manufacturing plant which it now is. During the Civil War it was the headquarters of the Potomac flotilla of gunboats. The Pensacola yard was the operating base for the Gulf Squadron during the Mexican War. In 1861 it was surrendered to Confederates who evacuated it in 1862. Since 1913 it has been used only for training in naval aviation. The Mare Island yard has been the principal one on the West coast since its first establishment by Commander D. G. Farragut, although deeper water at Puget Sound increasingly favors its use by large modern ships.

[*Hamersley's Naval Encyclopedia*, 1881.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

NC-4, Flight of the. On May 8, 1919, three Navy-Curtis seaplanes, John T. Towers, commander of the squadron, took off from Rockaway, Long Island, for Plymouth, England, with stops at Halifax, Trepassy (Newfoundland), the Azores and Lisbon. Sixty destroyers at intervals of seventy-five miles patrolled the course to give aid, if needed. All went well until the squadron approached the Azores, when two planes, lost in a fog, were forced down. The NC-1 sank, but its crew was rescued; the NC-3 "taxied" and drifted 209 miles to Ponta Delgada. But the NC-4, commanded by A. C. Read, reached Horta safely on May 17 and two weeks later arrived at Plymouth, after touching at Lisbon and Ferrol, Spain, with complete flying time of fifty-three hours and fifty-eight minutes.

[Secretary of the Navy, *Annual Report*, Dec. 1, 1919; Dudley W. Knox, *A History of the United States Navy.*]
CHARLES LEE LEWIS

Neagle, In re (135 U. S. 1, 1890), was a case in which the United States Supreme Court asserted the supremacy of Federal over state law. Under his authority to see that the laws are faithfully executed, President Benjamin Harrison, by executive order, directed David Neagle, a deputy United States marshal, to protect Justice Stephen J. Field of the Supreme Court against a threatened personal attack. At Stockton, Calif., as the

justice was traveling in the performance of his official duties, Neagle shot and killed David S. Terry as the latter made a murderous assault upon Justice Field. Arrested by California state authorities and charged with murder, Neagle was brought before the Federal circuit court upon a writ of habeas corpus⁹⁷, and released upon the ground that he was being held in custody for "an act done in pursuance of a law of the United States"; and his release was upheld by the Supreme Court.

P. ORMAN RAY

Near v. Minnesota (283 U. S. 697, 1931) invalidated an act of the State of Minnesota which provided for the abatement as a public nuisance of a "malicious, scandalous and defamatory newspaper, magazine or other periodical." *The Saturday Press* of Minneapolis had been so abated and Near, the editor, perpetually enjoined from further engaging in the business. The Supreme Court declared the statute unconstitutional on the grounds that freedom of the press⁹⁸ means freedom from previous restraint, and that the right to criticize public officials is a fundamental principle of free democratic government.

HARVEY PINNEY

Nebbia v. N. Y. (291 U. S. 502, 1934) sets forth a broad view of business "affected with a public interest." New York State in 1933 established a Milk Control Board empowered to fix maximum and minimum retail prices. A dealer, convicted of underselling, claimed that price fixing violated the Fourteenth Amendment's due process clause, save as applied to businesses affected with a public interest, that is, to public utilities or monopolies⁹⁹. The Supreme Court, upholding the law five to four, declared "there is no closed class" of businesses "affected with a public interest"; it includes any industry which, "for adequate reason, is subject to control for the public good."

[E. S. Bates, *The Story of the Supreme Court*; W. Anderson, *American Government*.]

RANSOM E. NOBLE, JR.

Nebraska, the Otoe name for the Platte, was used by the French explorer Bourgmont¹⁰⁰ in 1714. The purchase of Louisiana and the exploration of Lewis and Clark in 1804-6¹⁰¹ awakened American interest in the region. Manuel Lisa established Fort Lisa¹⁰² (1807-19) as a fur-trading post on the approximate site of Fort Calhoun. Fort Atkinson in the same region served as a military encampment and fort (1819-27). The expeditions and reports of Maj. Long¹⁰³ (1819-24) suggested the Great American Des-

ert¹⁰⁴. Bellevue, above the mouth of the Platte, became a permanent trading post in 1819 and remained the nucleus of white settlement. There Peter Sarpy became a renowned figure among both whites and Indians.

The leading Indian tribes within Nebraska were Omaha, Otoe, Missouri, Pawnee, Cheyenne and Sioux. The Omahas and Otoes and Missouri held the lands along the Missouri River. The Pawnee¹⁰⁵ were in central Nebraska extending from the north to the south border; while the Cheyennes¹⁰⁶ were in the southwestern parts of the state. The eastern tribes ceded their lands in 1854; the Pawnee, in 1857; the Cheyenne, in 1861; and the Sioux¹⁰⁷, in 1876.

Nebraska, as a designation of the area of the Platte watershed, was used by Frémont¹⁰⁸ in 1843. Proposed as a political territory by Secretary of War Wilkins, in 1844, the name appeared as the title of the bill presented to Congress. Douglas' first Nebraska bill defined a territory extending from the Missouri River on the east to the Continental Divide on the west; from the Niobrara River on the north to the Kansas and Arkansas rivers on the south. The Nebraska Act ten years later (*see* Kansas-Nebraska Act) changed the north and south boundaries to the Canadian border and the 40th parallel, respectively. Within those ten years the Overland Trail¹⁰⁹ had become the great continental highway. It was necessary to organize Nebraska Territory in order to compete with the Southern routes for the trans-continental railroad. Nebraska's area was restricted to approximately its present size by the creation of Colorado and Dakota territories in 1861. The northern boundary was changed from the Niobrara River to the 43rd parallel between the Keyapaha and the Missouri rivers in 1882.

Francis Burt of South Carolina became territorial governor Oct. 16, 1854, at Bellevue. Two days later he died, and Secretary Thomas B. Cuming of Michigan became acting governor. The first territorial legislature was assembled at Omaha Jan. 16, 1855. Territorial politics dealt chiefly with the location of the capital, slavery, the organization of legislative districts, the creation of counties, the disposal of state lands and the problem of statehood. The territorial governors were Mark W. Izard of Arkansas, 1855-57; W. A. Richardson of Illinois, 1857-58; Samuel W. Black of Pennsylvania, 1859-61, and Alvin Saunders, 1861-67.

In 1866 Congress passed an enabling act¹¹⁰ for the admission of Nebraska to statehood, but the constitutional convention regarded statehood as too expensive and adjourned *sine die*. Two years later the territorial legislature submitted to the

voters a constitution produced by its own committee, and it was declared adopted by a vote of 3938 to 3838. The first state legislature set up a capital which located and founded Lincoln. This climaxed but did not terminate the struggle between North Platte and South Platte political sections.

The constitution drafted by the convention of 1874 was rejected, but a similar effort the following year gave the state a new constitution. Railroad influence was dominant in state politics until the Populist^{er} rising of 1890. The constitution was revised by a convention in 1920 and the significant change to a one-house legislature became effective in 1937 (*see* Nebraska One-House Legislature).

[J. S. Morton and A. Watkins, *History of Nebraska*; A. E. Sheldon, *Nebraska*.]

J. L. SELLERS

Nebraska One-House Legislature, THE, was proposed in the constitutional convention, 1920, by John N. Norton. Sen. Norris revived the movement in 1934 and campaigned the state for its adoption. A committee headed by Norton formulated the amendment and secured 95,000 petition signatures to place it on the ballot. Nov. 6, 1934, it was adopted by a vote of 286,086 to 193,152. The amendment provided for a legislature of one house consisting of not more than fifty nor less than thirty members to be elected on a nonpartisan ballot. The number of members was fixed at forty-three by the legislature of 1935 and the districts were mapped by the same body. The total salary for the legislature, regardless of size, was fixed in the amendment at \$37,500 per annum. The first one-house legislature met in 1937; was organized in a nonpartisan fashion; adopted the name of Senate; and functioned very satisfactorily.

[J. P. Senning, *The One-House Legislature*.]

J. L. SELLERS

Necessity, Fort. *See* Great Meadows.

Needham-Arthur Expeditions (1673-74). With the erection in 1646 of Fort Henry (now Petersburg, Va.), commanded by the energetic, resourceful Abraham Wood, there began a generation of exploration, impelled by hopes of revealing a passage to Asia, arable lands, minerals, gems and peltries, and culminating in the journeys of James Needham and a youthful companion, Gabriel Arthur. Leaving the fort in May, 1673, they traveled southwestwardly, arriving finally at a village, seemingly on or near the Little Tennessee River, thereby becoming the first recorded Englishmen to reach the Tennessee

country. The Indians were called "Tomahitans"; as to whether they were Cherokee^{an} or pre-Cherokee, scholars disagree. Needham returned to Fort Henry, arriving Sept. 10, 1673. Within ten days he was on his way back to the Tamahita; en route he was treacherously slain by an Occaneechi Indian companion. Meanwhile, Arthur had joined Tamahita bands in journeys to Florida, South Carolina, the Ohio River vicinity and apparently down the Tennessee River; he was probably the first white man to navigate that stream and to visit the Kentucky country. By June, 1674, he was back at Fort Henry, where soon appeared a friendly Tamahita chieftain; the latter was so warmly welcomed by Wood and Arthur that he promised to return to the fort the ensuing autumn with many warriors and, presumably, with deerskins. Needham and Arthur had laid the foundations for English intercourse with the Indians of the southern Alleghenies.

[C. W. Alvord and L. Bidgood, *The First Explorations of the Trans-Allegheny Region by the Virginians, 1650-1674*.]

W. NEIL FRANKLIN

Neely v. Henkel (180 U S 109, 1901) was among the cases arising from the Spanish-American War and concerning the status of former Spanish possessions. The Supreme Court held that Cuba, although temporarily under a military governor appointed by the American President, was foreign territory, and not in any constitutional, legal, or international sense part of the United States.

[C. Warren, *The Supreme Court in United States History*.]

RANSOM E. NOBLE, JR.

Negative Voice. After the admission, in 1634, of Deputies into the General Court^{er} of Massachusetts Bay, the Assistants^{er} claimed a veto or "Negative Voice" over their acts. This precipitated a major political and constitutional issue, resolved when, in 1644, the court constituted itself a bicameral body of Assistants and Deputies, each with veto on the other.

[John Winthrop, *Journal*; C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, I.]

RAYMOND P. STEARNS

Negro, Free. *See* Free Negroes.

Negro, Judicial Protection of the, at the present time does not differ essentially from the protection of other natural persons who are citizens. The Negro has not always received such protection. Prior to the Fourteenth Amendment^{er} a Negro could not be a citizen of the United States, even though he could be a citizen of one of the several states; and even though he was a citizen

of a state he was not entitled to the protection of the interstate privileges and immunities clause.

The slavery amendments at first gave him a protection not extended to other natural persons, but now this protection has been extended to all natural persons. However, judicial protection has some interesting applications in the case of the Negro

The Thirteenth Amendment⁷⁰ protects him against slavery and involuntary servitude, either by the Federal Government or by a state or by the action of individuals, and this includes protection against peonage, specific performance of personal service contracts, and making a breach of a contract a crime punishable by hard labor.

The Fourteenth Amendment⁷¹ protects him not only as a citizen of the United States, but also, as a person, against the denial of the protection of equal laws and the deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process⁷² of law. The protection of equal Federal laws secures him against discrimination on account of his race. The Fifteenth Amendment⁷³ also guarantees him, under Federal jurisdiction, against discrimination on account of his race in the matter of suffrage. But neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor the Fifteenth Amendment protects him against reasonable local qualifications for voting or reasonable classification. The Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments are not aimed at individual action, so that the Negro is not by them protected against discrimination by innkeepers, common carriers and other public utilities; but the common law of public utilities does protect him against unreasonable discrimination. Segregation is not a violation of the law of public utilities (*see* "Jim Crow" Laws), and a state under the equality clause may constitutionally even require segregation of public utilities and others, if equal facilities are furnished, provided there is no interference with the right of the sale of property. If political parties are private and their elections are not authorized by a state government the constitutional limitation does not apply to them, and they may exclude Negroes from their primaries (*see* Negro Suffrage). The denial of the protection of equal laws may occur in the case of any branch of the Government, and an arbitrary exclusion from a jury will amount to such denial both for the person excluded from the jury and for the accused being tried before the jury.

The protection of due process of law has been of especial use to the Negro so far as it concerns procedure, because this has given him not only

a right to notice, a reasonable opportunity to be heard, and an impartial tribunal, but an orderly course of procedure, including freedom from mob domination and the right to counsel and an opportunity for counsel to prepare his case.

[H. E. Willis, *Constitutional Law of the United States*.]

HUGH E. WILLIS

Negro, THE. Negroes were brought into territory which was later to be a part of the United States as early as 1619 but until the late 17th century their number was small. From the beginning of the 18th century until the prohibition of the slave trade⁷⁴ in January, 1808, they were imported in ever increasing numbers. Even after the statutory closure of the slave trade many were smuggled in. This steady influx from abroad, together with natural reproduction, resulted in an increase in the Negro population from a few thousand in 1700 to 4,441,830 in 1860.

At first, Negroes imported came primarily from the West Indies, subsequently, however, most came directly from Africa. Among those brought to America there were very great differences in physique, cultural background, disposition and ability. Virtually all, however, proved capable of adapting themselves to conditions in America. Because of economic factors, the vast majority were concentrated in the South where they were principally employed in agriculture. The first Negroes brought to the English continental colonies apparently were considered to be indentured servants⁷⁵. But as their number and economic importance increased, they were forced into a slave status.

With the Revolution began a movement promising to alter fundamentally the Negro's position. As a result of emphasis placed on the rights of man⁷⁶ and the decline of the economic importance of slavery, during the period from 1777 to 1787 practically every Northern state provided for immediate or gradual emancipation, slavery was prohibited in the Northwest Territory⁷⁷, and such a strong antislavery sentiment appeared in most of the Southern states that eventual emancipation seemed certain.

However, with the revival of the economic importance of slavery incident to the development of cotton⁷⁸ culture and the opening of the Southwest, the emancipation movement rapidly declined in the Southern states. Further, in the free states there developed a strong reaction against Negroes which resulted in their being forced into a definitely inferior position socially, politically, juridically and economically.

During the Civil War and Reconstruction⁷⁹, however, there was an extremely rapid change in the condition of the Negro. Through the

Emancipation Proclamation and the Thirteenth Amendment⁹⁹ all slaves were freed and slavery was prohibited throughout the United States. Through the Civil Rights Bill and the Fourteenth Amendment⁹⁹ citizenship was conferred on Negroes. Through the Fifteenth Amendment⁹⁹ a state was prohibited from denying the right of suffrage to a person because of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Through provisions of "reconstruction" constitutions and acts of "reconstruction" in state governments, Negroes were given political, economic, juridical, and, in some cases, social equality with whites in certain Southern states. Through the activities of the Freedmen's Bureau⁹⁹, religious groups, private agencies, etc., efforts were made to educate and train Negroes for freedom. Further, as a consequence of reconstruction policies followed by the National Government, Negroes were placed in a position to dominate with "carpet-baggers" and "scalawags"⁹⁹ the governments of the Southern states for a period of years.

After the restoration of home rule⁹⁹, the Southern states deprived the Negro of most, though not all, of the gains made. The Negro was again placed on a generally inferior level and was subjected to varying degrees of oppression and mistreatment. At the same time, there was an economic and social reaction against the Negro in most of the other states of the Union.

In recent years great efforts have been made by both Negroes and interested white groups to improve the lot of the Negro. Despite tremendous obstacles, these efforts have resulted in considerable success, especially in the field of education.

[Carter G. Woodson, *The Negro in Our History*; John G. Van Deusen, *The Black Man in White America*.]

HAYWOOD J. PEARCE, JR.

Negro Churches as independent bodies began in the United States with the formation of the African Methodist Episcopal Church⁹⁹ in Philadelphia in 1816. Four years later the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church was formed in New York. Both denominations were made up of free Negroes⁹⁹ who felt more or less crowded out of the white churches to which they had formerly belonged. The laws of the slave states made it impossible for Negroes to form independent churches. There were, therefore, no independent Negro churches in the South previous to the Civil War. With emancipation, however, an entirely new situation was created. Northern Negroes entered the South as missionaries to their own race even before the Civil War ended, and Negro members of Southern white churches withdrew in large numbers to join in-

dependent Negro churches. As an illustration of this movement, there were, in 1860, 207,000 Negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; in 1866 their number had been reduced to 78,000 and in that year they withdrew to form the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church. Organization of Negro Baptist churches went forward rapidly throughout the South during the years of reconstruction⁹⁹ (1865-75), frequently aided by the whites. The Negro Baptists soon grew to be the most numerous body, with a membership in 1926 of 3,196,623, the largest organization controlled by Negroes in the world. There are 1,563,000 Negro Methodists; 124,324 Negro Catholics; 51,502 Negro Episcopalians; about 40,000 in the several Presbyterian bodies; 37,325 Negro Disciples and 16,000 Negro Congregationalists. The total number of Negro church members in the United States in 1926 was 5,203,487 divided among fifty-five denominations of which the large majority are independent Negro bodies.

[C. G. Woodson, *History of the Negro Church; Religious Bodies: 1926*, United States Department of Commerce, The Bureau of the Census, 1930, Vol. I, pp. 706-762.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Negro Culture in the United States is more like white culture than it is anywhere else in the New World. One of the most striking facts about the Negro in this country is his almost complete acculturation. His language, institutions, folkways and values are essentially white. The transition from African to English patterns was for the most part natural. However, the whites exercised caution in the handling of raw slaves from Africa and made some deliberate effort to repress savage customs. Under the domestic and small-plantation type of slavery which prevailed in the 175 years from the introduction of slaves to the invention of the cotton gin⁹⁹, it was virtually impossible for any African tribal culture to function as an entity.

This is not to say that the Negro came to America culturally naked or that he lost absolutely everything he brought. Negroes represented diverse African cultures, some of them highly developed in art, music and social organization. Certain phases of their African cultures survive to greater or lesser degree and some have been incorporated into our national culture. Several African words have been Anglicized (for example, *okra*, *gumbo*, *goober*, *cooter*, *buckra*), and there is possibly some carry-over of Africanisms in Negro idiomatic expressions. In Negro music the persistence of African rhythms has been strong. It is chiefly this element which accounts for the distinctive flavor of the Negro

spirituals, blues, jazz and dance forms, all of which have had a pronounced influence on American popular music. Considerable folklore²⁷ survives in the form of animal tales, proverbs and folk beliefs, and there may be various minor and intangible ways in which the old African traits persist. Nevertheless, the Negro is so thoroughly Americanized that African survivals are relatively unimportant in his total culture.

[Guy B. Johnson, *Some Factors in the Development of Negro Social Institutions in the United States*, *American Journal of Sociology*, XL; Melville J. Herskovits, *Social History of the Negro*, *A Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by Carl Murchison.]

GUY B. JOHNSON

Negro Education became an important issue early in slavery. Southern whites believed almost unanimously in the impossibility and undesirability of educating Negroes. Realizing that education would threaten the institution of slavery²⁸, they passed numerous laws to prevent Negroes from being taught. In the North public sentiment was only slightly less hostile. Emancipation found about 95% of the Negroes illiterate.

During the Civil War and Reconstruction period Negro education leaped forward rapidly under the sponsorship of the Freedmen's Bureau²⁹ and philanthropic agencies from the North. The Reconstruction governments in the South attempted to provide public schools in which there would be no racial segregation. Negro education became a burning issue, socially, politically and financially, and when the Southern whites returned to power they established separate school systems. Inequalities in financial support appeared immediately, and, while much progress has been made, glaring racial differentials in per-pupil expenditures, teachers' salaries, length of school terms, etc., persist in most of the Southern states. Deficiencies have been offset to some extent by private philanthropy. Negro illiteracy stood at 16.3% in 1930.

Recent trends in Negro education include: (1) growing liberalism of Southern white opinion toward Negro education; (2) increasing financial support by the states; (3) the rise of A-grade state colleges and the declining importance of denominational colleges; (4) rapid increase in the number of Negro college graduates and a heavier demand for state support of graduate and professional training of Negroes in the South; (5) the tendency to concentrate philanthropic support for higher education in a few strategic locations; (6) the entrance of the separate school issue into Northern states where Negroes have migrated in large numbers; and (7)

test cases brought by Negroes to question the legal right of a state to maintain racial differentials in educational opportunity.

[H. M. Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order*; Carter G. Woodson, *Education of the Negro prior to 1861*.]

GUY B. JOHNSON

"Negro Plot" of 1741. Widespread fires in New York City broke out in the early part of 1741, starting at the fort at the lower end of Manhattan. An hysterical populace attributed these to an incendiary Negro plot, actually believing that the Negroes were being supported by the Spaniards supposed to be aiming to establish Popery in New York. Though no real foundation to support a conspiracy was ever established, thirty-five persons, mostly Negroes, were executed, and seventy transported.

[D. Horsmanden, *Journal of the Proceedings in the Detection of the Conspiracy*.]

RICHARD B. MORRIS

Negro Soldiers. During the American Revolution, Negroes both free and slave were admitted into the armed forces, though generally against much opposition. The total enlisted probably did not exceed 1000. In the War of 1812, Negroes were generally excluded except in Louisiana, where free Negroes³⁰ were enlisted for service in Jackson's army defending New Orleans. No record has been found of Negro soldiers in the Mexican War.

At the outbreak of the Civil War free Negroes promptly sought service in both armies. In the North, at first there was reluctance, even hostility, to employing Negroes as soldiers. Gen. Hunter in South Carolina and Gen. Butler in New Orleans were among the first to enlist them (*see* Emancipation, Frémont and Hunter Proclamations). Rhode Island issued the first Northern state call. Kansas and Massachusetts soon followed. In New York, however, feeling toward Negro enlistments was unfriendly and was a factor in the Draft Riots³¹. After the Emancipation Proclamation³² Lincoln, released from constitutional scruples, gave authority for four Negro regiments; on April 8, 1863, the official administration policy was promulgated. By mid-1863, Federal recruiting included both the seceded and border states.

Every state in the Union, and those in secession, furnished Negro soldiers, the total enrolled approximating 300,000. Usually, these troops were used for garrison duty, guarding lines of communication and trains, etc. Negro organizations participated in battles at Milliken's Bend, Olustee, Battery Wagner, The Crater, Honey Hill and at Fort Pillow. Negro soldiers consti-

tuted the 25th Corps in Grant's army besieging Richmond^{er}.

In 1866 Congress authorized four permanent Negro regiments. They served in the West against Indians and on garrison duty; in the Spanish-American War and in the Philippines. During the World War, two Negro divisions were organized. In general, Negro troops have served effectively and without friction with the communities in which stationed. One notable exception resulted in the Brownsville Riot^{er}.

[G. W. Williams, *A History of the Negro Troops in the War of the Rebellion, 1861-65.*]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Negro Stealing probably reduced hundreds of free colored people of both the Northern and Southern states to slavery. Base men found it more lucrative than reclaiming fugitive slaves for rewards of \$100 or less. In 1817 Baltimore Quakers petitioned Congress to protect Negroes against kidnapping^{er}. In Jackson's administration Negro stealers took both free and enslaved blacks from Seminole chiefs in Florida and sold them in Alabama and Georgia. Cincinnati, Ohio, with 2500 Negroes—many of them self-purchased—was a favorite spot for kidnappers from Kentucky in the 1890's and later, despite frequent observance of legal forms. In Washington, D. C., Negroes without their free papers were sold to pay their jail fees and got little chance to prove their right to freedom before joining the coffin. Other places supplied occasional victims, but the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850^{er} introduced "the era of slave-hunting," when the kidnapping of free colored residents helped arouse many Northern communities.

[Harriet Beecher Stowe, *A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin*; Henry Wilson, *Rise and Fall of the Slave Power in America*; *Proceedings of the Ohio Antislavery Convention* held at Putnam, 1853.]

WILBUR H. SIEBERT

Negro Suffrage. In the colonial period, except in South Carolina and Georgia, Negroes could vote if they could meet the property qualifications which generally prevailed. At the beginning of the Civil War Negroes could vote only in six states, in New York under special property qualifications, and in Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont and Rhode Island. The new state constitutions in the former Confederate states immediately after the Civil War continued the exclusion of Negroes from the franchise. The Fourteenth Amendment^{er}, proposed by Congress in 1866, still left the control of suffrage to the states, but made an indirect approach to Negro suffrage in its second section, by which the congressional representation of any

state would be reduced according as the state denied suffrage to male citizens, except as punishment for crime. In 1867 the Reconstruction Acts^{er} of Congress enforced Negro suffrage on the former Confederate states, both in the temporary process of reconstruction and in the permanent constitutions of the states. In 1870 the Fifteenth Amendment^{er} was ratified, which affected all, not merely the states which had seceded. While the amendment did not confer the vote on Negroes, it prohibited any state from denying suffrage on the grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

In the South, where resistance to Negro suffrage was strong on the part of the whites, various devices were used to circumvent the Fifteenth Amendment, after the conservative whites resumed control of the state governments (*see* Home Rule, Restoration of, in the South). Intimidation by such organizations as the Ku Klux^{er}, fraud in registration and voting procedures; the requirement of the payment of poll and other taxes and the presentation of receipt for payment, which Negroes would be unlikely to meet; educational qualifications with exemptions to ignorant whites by the "Grandfather Clause"^{er}; the Democratic white primary system—were some of the measures devised to prohibit or restrict Negro suffrage. In the South in the 1880's and 1890's the white voters split into factions on the agrarian question^{er} and Negroes were drawn into voting ranks by one side or the other. Since 1900, however, the return to the one-party system has again reduced Negro suffrage to a negligible place in the South (*see* Solid South). In the Northern states, since the ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment, Negroes vote under the same qualifications as govern white suffrage.

[Paul Lewinson, *Race, Class, and Party.*]

C. MILDRED THOMPSON

Negroes, Movement of, to the North, began on a large scale during the World War, due to the demand for laborers in Northern factories. The movement is best measured by the 1930 census which shows that: (1) between 1920 and 1930 the number of Negroes living in the North but born in the South increased from 737,423 to 1,355,789; (2) 58% of the Negroes living in the North and West were born in the South; (3) all Southern states except Delaware, West Virginia, Florida, Arkansas and Oklahoma show a loss in Negro population.

Negroes migrating north have tended to concentrate in the largest cities with the result that one third of the Negro population of the North

is found in the four cities, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Baltimore.

The causes of this migration are in part economic. The need for labor during the World War and the restriction of foreign immigration^u in 1924 made a place for the Negro laborer in Northern factories at higher wages than the South offered. The Negro also found less discrimination in education, politics and other phases of community life than he found in the South.

Migration to the North temporarily improved the Negro's economic situation by giving him higher wages and a wider choice of occupations than the South offered him. But it has caused serious problems in the Northern cities. Congestion has created problems of housing and health. It has also increased the amount of crime, immorality and juvenile delinquency among the Negroes. Closer contact with the white race has led to increased race prejudice and racial conflict.

[L. V. Kennedy, *The Negro Peasant Turns Cityward.*]
HALLIE FARMER

Negroes, Races of, Imported as Slaves. The question of the African origin of the American Negro slaves still awaits a thorough scientific study. From the available records, it seems that Negroes were brought to America from various parts of Africa, and particularly from the region lying between the Gambia and Niger rivers. Some authorities maintain that most of them came from the West African subregion of the Congo area, and the northwestern portion of the Congo itself. The contemporary records refer to the grain, slave, gold and ivory coasts, Angola, Kameroun, Sierra Leone, the Senegal River and a number of other places as the sources of slaves. At least twenty different tribes or stocks were represented among the millions of Negroes brought to America between 1619 and 1860 (it is estimated that over 2,000,000 were imported into the United States after 1808, the date of the legal abolition of the foreign slave trade^u). The principal tribes which contributed to the American slave population were the Senegalese, noted for their intelligence and aptitude for domestic service and mechanical work; the Mandingoes, who were in particular demand in South Carolina; the Coromantes, who were "strong, haughty, ferocious, and stubborn"; the Pawpaws, Nagoes and Whydahs, who were considered "lusty, industrious, cheerful, and submissive"; the Eboes, who had a proclivity to suicide; the Mocoos, Bantus, Efiks and others

[U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*; Jerome Dowd, *The Negro Races.*]

HUGH T. LEFLER

Nelson, Fort, Ky., at the Falls of the Ohio^u, named for Gov. Thomas Nelson of Virginia, was built in the summer of 1782, by Col. John Floyd, on orders from George Rogers Clark^u, to replace a small stockade fort built several years previous. Fort Nelson served as Clark's headquarters until incorporated in the town of Louisville in 1785.

[R. T. Durrett, *Memorial History of Louisville*; L. Collins, *History of Kentucky.*]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Nelson-Davis Quarrel, THE (1862), resulted from critical disciplinary remarks by Gen. William Nelson (U.) at Louisville (see Kentucky, Invasion of) to Gen. Jefferson C. Davis (U.). On Sept. 29, 1862, Davis, in company with Gov. Morton of Indiana, met Nelson in the Galt Hotel. Davis demanded "satisfaction." Nelson refused. Davis flipped a wadded card into Nelson's face. Nelson slapped him and walked away. Davis borrowed a revolver, sought Nelson and shot him. He died within an hour. Davis was indicted, but was never tried.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War.*]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Neshaminy is the name of a creek which flows in a generally southerly direction into the Delaware River about three miles north of the Philadelphia city line. Near its banks was established William Tennent's "Log College"^u. Washington encamped here, Aug. 10, 1777, while awaiting word of where the British army, then at sea, would land. He left here, Aug. 23, to meet the British force when it unexpectedly sailed up the Chesapeake. The battle of Brandywine^u followed.

[William S. Baker, *Itinerary of General Washington.*]

HARRY EMERSON WILDES

Nesters and the Cattle Industry. Following the slaughter of the buffalo^u, cattle grazing on the open range^u of the Western plains from Texas to Montana became the major industry. The cattlemen divided the public domain^u into large grazing tracts, some of which they fenced. When the farmers, contemptuously called nesters, attempted to settle on the range, the cattlemen kept them out by intimidation and in some rare instances by murder. The contest of the ranger and the granger continued from 1867 to 1886. Congress passed a law, Feb. 25, 1885, prohibiting interference with settlers, and President Cleveland followed this with an enforcement proclamation, Aug. 7, 1885. Of greater potency was the great blizzard^u of January, 1886. Freezing rain encased the buffalo grass, on which the cat-

tle depended for winter feed, in a glare of ice. There followed driving snow with zero temperatures. Range cattle died of freezing and starvation, and most of the cattle barons were ruined. Commencing with the spring of 1886 homesteaders⁷⁷, streaming west in covered wagons⁷⁸ on a 1000-mile front, occupied the public domain on the plains. In the mountain states the contest continued in isolated areas until recent years.

[Edward Everett Dale, *The Range Cattle Industry*; T. A. McNeal, *When Kansas Was Young*.]

BLISS ISELY

Netherlands Award (1831). At the close of the War of 1812 the Treaty of Ghent⁷⁹ established a mixed boundary commission to mark the northeastern boundary⁸⁰, with a provision that if the commission could not agree the matter should be referred to the arbitration of some friendly sovereign or state. A special treaty of 1827 so referred to the arbitration of the King of the Netherlands specific points of difference in the commission concerning that part of the line between the source of the St. Croix and the "north west angle of Nova Scotia." Instead of deciding on the points in difference, as obliged by the treaty, the arbitrator laid down a compromise line which, roughly speaking, "split the difference." Great Britain did not object when the United States refused to accept the award on the valid ground that the arbitrator had exceeded his authority. After much further dispute the line was finally fixed by the Webster-Ashburton Treaty⁸¹ of 1842, which treaty line does not vary much from the compromise of the arbitrator in 1831.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*; John Bassett Moore, *History and Digest of International Arbitrations to Which the United States Has Been a Party*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

"Neutral Ground." During the American Revolution, Westchester County, N. Y., especially the Bronx, then within that county, was known by this term because it was not consistently occupied by either side, and the sympathies of its inhabitants were divided. Gen. Howe in 1776 began there his advance to White Plains⁸².

After 1806 the region between the Arroyo Hondo, near Natchitoches⁸³, La., and the Sabine River, near Nacogdoches⁸⁴, Tex., received this name as a result of the "Neutral Ground" agreement between Gen. James Wilkinson and the Spanish Lt. Commander Simon de Herrera.

Another area received the name in 1830, when the Sioux on the north and the Sauk and Fox⁸⁵ on the south each ceded twenty miles of land

along a line from the Mississippi to the Des Moines River, leaving a forty-mile "Neutral Ground" in which they could hunt, but must remain peaceful.

[Charles Pryer, *The Neutral Ground*; Walter F. McCaleb, *The Aaron Burr Conspiracy*; Bureau of American Ethnology, *18th Annual Report*, Indian Land and Cessions.]

PHILIP COOLIDGE BROOKS

Neutral Rights are based on the basic right of a free and independent nation to remain at peace with other nations and to take no part in an armed conflict between belligerents⁸⁶, either in an international or in a civil war. While recognizing that the exigencies of modern warfare entail considerable restrictions on the normal intercourse of neutrals in time of peace, the United States has always insisted on the right of American citizens to trade and maintain friendly relations with the peoples of other nations in time of war.

Until recent times the United States has vigorously upheld the "freedom of the seas"⁸⁷ and denied the right of belligerents to restrict that freedom other than as may reasonably be required by military necessity. The denial of the freedom of the seas by Germany was the primary reason for the entry of the United States in the World War⁸⁸ of 1914-18.

The earliest assertion of neutral rights by the United States was contained in the Plan of 1776⁸⁹. They were embodied in the treaty of alliance with France in 1778 (*see Franco-American Alliance*). They were proclaimed by President Washington in 1793 (*see Neutrality, Proclamation of, 1793*), and Congress, by the act of 1794, and by subsequent statutes reaching over a century and a half, endeavored to safeguard these rights.

Presidents Jefferson and Madison heroically, though ineffectually, attempted to maintain the right of American citizens to engage in peaceful commerce with other nations during the Napoleonic wars (*see Embargo; Nonintercourse Act*). The claim by Great Britain of the right to search American vessels for British subjects was firmly resisted by diplomatic protests and, finally, by resort to war in 1812 (*see Impressment of Seamen*).

President Wilson vigorously upheld neutral rights in the World War, but the United States was constrained to acknowledge that modern methods of warfare, notably the use of the submarine and aeroplane, as well as the conscription of all the resources of a belligerent nation, exacted important restrictions on freedom of intercourse by neutrals, even with other neutrals.

Subsequent legislation concerning neutral rights has been dictated by the policy of lessening the dangers of involvement by the United States in foreign wars.

The main principles affecting neutral rights which the United States has consistently advocated throughout its entire history may be summarized as follows:

(I) A neutral nation will abstain from taking sides. It will be strictly impartial in its treatment of belligerents. It will take no steps tending to redress the balance of the fortunes of war.

(II) A neutral nation will acquiesce in certain restrictions on normal peaceful intercourse, such as blockade, visit and search of its merchant ships, the seizure of contraband and exclusion from actual areas of combat.

(III) A neutral nation will do all in its power to prevent its territory from being used as a base of hostile operations. This includes such acts as the fitting out and equipment of belligerent warships, the enlistment of soldiers, the use of radio stations by belligerents and many other acts of an unneutral nature.

(IV) Belligerents will respect this attitude of strict neutrality and refrain from any infringements on the independence of neutral nations, or any interference with neutral rights other than required by the unavoidable necessities of warfare. All violations of neutral rights require immediate, effective redress.

[Charles Cheney Hyde, *International Law*.]

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN

Neutrality. The term neutrality has two connotations. It may designate the status under international law of states not involved as belligerents⁷⁷ in war. Or it may denote the policy of such states with reference to the war. This article deals chiefly with the evolution of the policy of neutrality which has figured so conspicuously in the history of the United States.

This policy traditionally embraced two objectives: to avoid belligerent participation in certain wars; and to achieve this without sacrificing private intercourse with warring nations. To this end the Government was to maintain a legal impartiality and assume certain duties prescribed by international law⁷⁸. But private individuals might carry on their commercial activities, activities protected under international law by the doctrine of neutral rights⁷⁹. Thus, later struggles over neutral rights and duties have meaning only when reference is made to the objectives that lay behind them: the abstention from foreign wars and the protection of private intercourse with belligerents and other neutrals during such wars.

It is impossible to say precisely when this conception of neutrality began to take form in America. It certainly antedated the Revolution (1776). By 1790 there was a well-formed opinion that the security, perhaps the existence, of the republic depended upon keeping out of European wars, refraining from intervention in the internal affairs of European countries, and avoiding commitments incompatible with neutrality and nonintervention. The founding fathers were also alive to the apparent economic advantages of a neutrality which left private individuals free to carry on commerce with warring nations. And when confronted with the French Revolution (1789) and the ensuing European wars (1792-1815), they elaborated a system of policy in accord with these considerations.

President Washington's recognition of the revolutionary republican regime in France, coupled with his proclamation of neutrality⁸⁰ (April, 1793), served notice that the United States Government, despite our alliance of 1778 with France⁸¹, had no intention of entering the struggle against the European coalition of kings then attempting to restore the Bourbon monarchy in France. The Neutrality Act of June, 1794, elaborated regulations which, though complying with the international law of that day, nevertheless placed few restrictions on private intercourse with belligerents. And in numerous pronouncements, including Washington's Farewell Address⁸² (September, 1796), American statesmen stressed the importance of avoiding alliances or other commitments incompatible with neutrality.

The practice of neutrality, however, involved grave difficulties under conditions then existing. Lacking sufficient armed force to command respect for their claims of neutral rights upon the sea, American statesmen were unable to forestall belligerent aggressions against American commerce. These aggressions added fuel to the fires of popular passion already kindled by the ideological and social upheaval in Europe. A rupture with Great Britain was narrowly avoided by the negotiation of the Jay Treaty⁸³ (1794). A similar crisis with France led to naval reprisals and a quasi-war upon the sea (*see Franco-American Misunderstanding; Naval War with France*). Following the truce of Amiens (1801-3), the European struggle was resumed, with neutral commerce the object of unprecedented belligerent aggressions. In 1807 the Jefferson administration resorted to a general embargo⁸⁴ on shipping, in an effort both to insulate the United States from the spreading conflagration, and to compel some measure of respect for neutral rights. Jefferson's embargo did cause hardship abroad, especially

in England, but it was abandoned (1809), because of domestic dissatisfaction, before it had time to force the belligerents to American terms. And finally, neutrality itself was abandoned in 1812 (*see* War of 1812).

This final step, however, was taken at the instance of the agrarian West rather than the commercial East which had suffered most from belligerent aggressions (*see* War Hawks). The shipping interests had incurred heavy losses as a result of these aggressions, but their profits had far exceeded their losses, and they generally preferred to put up with aggressions when the alternative was war with Great Britain, their best customer. It was the land-hungry western frontier which utilized the issues of impressment⁷⁰ of American seamen and freedom of the seas⁷¹ for American commerce, to arouse popular support for a war really undertaken for the conquest of Canada and Florida.

The long and ultimately unsuccessful struggle to stay out of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars wrought practically no change in the American policy of neutrality. However, the century that followed the final overthrow of Bonaparte found the United States making repeated efforts to protect its commerce in wartime by clarifying and extending the principles of neutral rights. Attempts were made to forbid paper blockades, to assure the inviolability of neutral goods on enemy ships unless contraband⁷², to establish the doctrine of free ships—free goods⁷³, to narrow the definition of contraband, to prohibit profiteering, and to exempt private property from belligerent seizure unless contraband. The Declaration of Paris⁷⁴ (1856) embodied some of these objectives, but the United States refused to accede because the Declaration did not include the exemption of private property unless contraband from belligerent seizure. The fact remained, however, that many of the principles for which the United States had striven for forty years were now accepted by the major powers, and that the United States adhered to many of these stipulations in actual practice.

The Civil War (1861–65) disrupted efforts to widen the concept of neutral rights. The United States found itself in the role of a belligerent blockading the Southern states (*see* Confederate States, Blockade of). A loose blockade was employed and defended, contraband lists were enlarged and the doctrine of continuous voyage⁷⁵ was expanded in several important cases (*Bermuda*, *Peterhoff*, *Springbok*⁷⁶ and so forth). Thus, during the Civil War the United States espoused interpretations of neutral rights and belligerent rights at considerable variance with

earlier efforts. These interpretations were to become embarrassing when cited against the United States by the British in the years 1914–17 when the roles (of belligerent and neutral) were once more reversed. The successful arbitration of the Alabama claims⁷⁷ (1871) did serve, however, to clarify the concept of neutral duties.

Efforts to widen the interpretation of neutral rights did not cease with the Civil War. American delegates to the first Peace Conference at The Hague⁷⁸ (1899) attempted once more to gain approval for the inviolability of private property except contraband. Although unsuccessful, another effort was made at the Second Hague Conference (1907) but again the great maritime powers refused to accept this principle. A final prewar attempt to solve the perplexing problems of neutral rights, particularly of contraband, was attempted in 1909, but the compromises which emerged in the Declaration of London⁷⁹ were never ratified.

Two other developments during the century between 1815 and 1917 had important bearing on the neutrality program. The policy of neutrality, conceived originally with reference to European wars, was extended and applied to armed conflicts in Latin America and the Far East. But there were exceptions and qualifications with respect to these regions. American statesmen early took the view (1823) that intervention calculated to extend European power over Latin America would constitute a menace to the United States, and hence constitute a *prima-facie* case for counter intervention. This principle, the essence of the Monroe Doctrine⁸⁰, served to except from the operation of our neutrality policy wars that involved foreign powers and Latin-American states. For many reasons this exception to our neutrality policy has never provided a doorway to war for the United States, but this modification of our policy, given other circumstances, may prove of the greatest importance. In time, also, American statesmen gravitated toward a Far Eastern policy⁸¹ which, too, might prove irreconcilable with neutrality. While they never formally engaged to maintain the open door⁸² or its corollary, the territorial integrity of China, they had constantly, after 1900, to envisage the possible necessity of armed intervention if they were to preserve the *status quo* in the Pacific.

Efforts to maintain and develop the traditional neutrality policy had, up to the World War, not been conspicuously successful. Policies essentially incompatible with neutrality had been evolved for Latin America and the Far East. Efforts to maintain neutral rights during the Na-

poleonic wars had largely failed, and civil war had further undermined efforts to that end. Peacetime attempts to clarify and extend the principles of neutral rights had been largely unsuccessful. It was an unanswered question whether the traditional policy could stand the strain of a general European war, especially one involving Great Britain in another desperate struggle for command of the seas.

The record of American neutrality in the World War²⁰ left that fundamental question still unanswered. According to one interpretation, Germany's submarine warfare left intervention the only course consistent with the national honor and prestige of the United States. According to another, the failure of neutrality was attributable to the partisan attitude and diplomatic mistakes of the Wilson administration. A third interpretation stressed belligerent propaganda as the crucial factor in the breakdown of American neutrality. A fourth emphasized the commercial and financial bond which was forged between the Allied war machine and the mines, farms and factories of the United States.

This historical controversy, in conjunction with the political drift after the war, stimulated a movement for reconsideration of the traditional policy. While certain critics maintained that the breakdown of American neutrality was due not so much to any deficiency in the traditional policy, as it was to the mistakes of the men who administered it, others questioned the policy itself. These latter in turn divided roughly into two groups. One favored scrapping neutrality altogether, adopting instead a system of collective security as envisaged in the Covenant of the League of Nations²¹. The other rejected the doctrine of collective security and advocated a neutrality strengthened and revised in the light of war experience. The program of this last group came eventually to embrace restricting commerce with all belligerents, prohibiting loans to them, and strictly regulating American travel on belligerent ships and in war zones. Boundaries between these different points of view were never sharp. One merged into another. But they did constitute foci around which American opinion tended to cluster and develop during the post-war years.

All efforts to resolve these divergent theories proved unsuccessful. Starting in 1927-28, those who wished the United States to participate in the system of collective security brought forward proposals to embargo arms traffic with declared aggressors and to implement the Pact of Paris²². Isolationist sentiment in Congress prevented passage of legislation changing our neutrality policy

in this direction. A deadlock between the three schools of thought might have continued indefinitely had events in Europe and Asia not cast their shadows across the debate.

The failure to apply sanctions against Japan (1931-33) and collapse of the economic and disarmament conferences²³ (1932-33) weakened faith in collective security as an alternative to the traditional neutrality policy. With interest once more focused on neutrality, the choice was between maintaining neutral rights and curtailing those rights by domestic legislation. The Munitions Investigation (1934-36) developed popular support for the latter alternative by emphasizing the influence of neutral-belligerent trade as well as executive partiality in leading the United States into the last war. The rising crisis between Italy and Ethiopia in the summer of 1935 finally forced Congress to a decision. Under threat of filibuster the administration accepted a compromise which embodied some of the desires of the revisionists, left foreign commerce largely untouched, and provided few restrictions on executive discretion.

This temporary act²⁴ (August, 1935), subsequently amended (February, 1936) and extended to May 1, 1937, tided the United States through the Italo-Ethiopian War. A special act (January, 1937) extended its salient provisions to the civil war in Spain. The act of May 1, 1937, although more comprehensive in scope, was in reality another compromise of irreconcilable points of view. That the desire to throw the weight of the United States against aggressor nations still existed was amply demonstrated by the attitude of the administration toward this legislation. In the Italo-Ethiopian War the neutrality statute was energetically enforced when its application would operate against Italy. However, in the undeclared Sino-Japanese War it was not invoked because it was believed that its application would harm China and benefit Japan. A final indication of this same tendency was the neutrality legislation enacted in October, 1939. The long anticipated war had broken out in Europe and our legislation was to be put to the test. Almost immediately the administration advocated a repeal of the arms embargo which, if adopted, would throw the support of our munitions industries on the side of the English and French alone because they controlled the seas. After some weeks of debate Congress repealed the arms embargo but enacted at the same time other restrictions on commerce and travel designed to reduce the chances of our involvement. This attempt at neutrality legislation offered one more proof that the basic disagreement as to

the proper course for the United States in time of war had not been finally resolved. American opinion was hopelessly divided, and neutrality remained one of the unsolved, perhaps insoluble, problems confronting American statesmanship.

[While there is no comprehensive work covering the history of American neutrality, there is a large literature dealing with particular phases or periods. Most of this literature is cited with critical annotations in S. F. Bemis and G. G. Griffin, *Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States*, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1935, pp. 72-73, 110-111, 137-140, 665-668. Those lacking access to this invaluable bibliography may consult the following special works: J. F. Rippey and Angie Debo, *The Historical Background of the American Policy of Isolation*, in *Smith College Studies in History*, Vol. 9, 1924, pp. 71-165, origins; C. M. Thomas, *American Neutrality in 1793*, formulation of traditional policy; J. W. Pratt, *Expansionists of 1812*, breakdown of neutrality, 1812; C. G. Fenwick, *The Neutrality Laws of the United States*, legislation down to the World War; for conflicting interpretations of the breakdown of neutrality in the World War, the following four works: Charles Seymour, *American Diplomacy during the World War*; Walter Millis, *Road to War*, E. M. Borchard and W. P. Lage, *Neutrality for the United States*; Stephen and Joan Raushenbush, *The Final Choice*. The last named work also summarizes the findings of the Senate Munitions Investigation. For current developments consult the annual volumes entitled, *The United States in World Affairs*, published by the Council on Foreign Relations, New York City.]

JAMES A. PERKINS
HAROLD SPROUT

Neutrality, Proclamation of (1793). When news arrived in the United States in April, 1793, of the declaration of war by France against Great Britain, and the extension of the wars of the French Revolution into a great maritime war, it was the general disposition of the Government and the people, despite a strong predilection for the old ally, France (*see* Franco-American Alliance), to remain neutral—in fact, France preferred her ally to be neutral, as a storehouse of foodstuffs and naval stores to be moved in American neutral ships to France despite the preponderant British navy, under the protection of the Freedom of the Seas⁹⁰ if possible. President Washington hurried to Philadelphia from Mount Vernon, and after earnest discussion with his Cabinet decided on a policy of strict neutrality. A proclamation to that effect was drawn up by Edmund Randolph, Attorney General, and signed by the President and Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson. At the latter's suggestion, it studiously avoided the word neutrality, hoping that the absence of this would be noted by Great Britain and persuade that power to make concessions of maritime practice to the United States in order to keep it neutral. The proclamation of April 22, 1793—a landmark in the history of international law and neutral rights⁹¹ and obliga-

tions—enjoined upon citizens of the United States a friendly and impartial conduct and warned them against committing or abetting hostilities against any of the belligerent powers under penalty of "punishment or forfeiture under the law of nations," particularly if they should carry "articles which are deemed contraband⁹² by the modern usage of nations." Jefferson thought the use of the word *modern* very significant in that it might dispute the British traditional practice of including foodstuffs and naval stores in the category of contraband, which was contrary to American practice.

Despite the absence of the word "neutrality"⁹³ in the proclamation, the belligerent powers, and the neutral world, regarded it as a genuine proclamation of neutrality—as indeed it was—and even the United States Government soon lapsed into the usage of referring to the document as the proclamation of neutrality. The policy fixed by this proclamation was carefully carried out, in adherence to the strict letter of treaty obligations, and the executive rules proclaimed to enforce it were soon legislated into the Neutrality Act of June 5, 1794. It set American precedent and law for neutrality, which institution, and the problems connected with it, have since constituted a major part of the diplomatic history of the United States.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Jay's Treaty, a Study in Commerce and Diplomacy*, and *A Diplomatic History of the United States*; Charles Marion Thomas, *American Neutrality in 1793*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Neutrality Act of 1939, THE. Impending war in Europe made the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt and, in general, the public of the United States, in the spring and summer of 1938, apprehensive lest the Neutrality Acts of 1935, 1936 and 1937⁹⁴ would prevent Great Britain and France from purchasing arms, ammunition and implements of warfare in the United States during the next war. Under international law⁹⁵, as unamended by domestic legislation, belligerents⁹⁶ would have a perfect right to purchase contraband⁹⁷ of all kinds in a neutral state, and the power which controlled the seas would be able to secure their safe delivery. But the existing neutrality acts had superimposed restrictions and self-denials on American neutrality beyond that called for by international law. These self-denials, particularly the embargo on the export of arms, ammunition and implements of warfare to belligerents in time of war, had been accepted under the theory that, profiting by our experience during the World War, they would serve to keep us out of the next war. If this legis-

lation were to be repealed without any deviation from strict neutrality, it was necessary to do so before the next war should break out, but isolationist sentiment in Congress prevented any amendment of the existing domestic neutrality legislation before Congress rose in the summer of 1939.

The Neutrality Law of 1939 was approved on Nov. 4, after the war between Germany, on the one hand, and Poland, France and the British Empire, on the other hand, had commenced in September. It was therefore a relaxation, after the war began, of previously self-imposed obligations of neutrality⁹⁰. To this extent the act was a deviation from strict juridical neutrality. It was in fact a diplomatic instrument, the purpose of which was to help the Allies win the war without the United States joining the war. Briefly summarized, the act provided:

(1) "Whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between two states, and that it is necessary to promote the security, preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation," putting into effect the statute. By the provisions of this section it is clear that the act did not apply to all wars: it did not apply to civil wars (as did the previous Neutrality Act of 1937); and it did not apply to those wars which both the President and Congress believed not to affect the peace or security of the United States or the lives of its citizens; for example, the law was immediately applied to the war between Germany and its enemies, but not to the subsequent war between Russia and Finland.

(2) The act omitted any embargo on arms, ammunition or implements of war, or on anything else (in contrast to the neutrality legislation of 1935-37) but forbade American ships to carry arms, ammunition or implements of war.

(3) It forbade American ships to go to belligerent ports in Europe or North Africa, i.e., as far south as the Canary Islands.

(4) It prohibited arming of American merchant ships.

(5) It gave discretionary power to the President to forbid American ships to enter such "combat zones" as he should proclaim. He immediately proclaimed a zone which included the waters around the British Isles and European Atlantic waters from the Spanish boundary to Bergen, Norway, including all the Baltic coasts.

(6) It prohibited American citizens traveling on belligerent vessels.

(7) It allowed American ships to carry all goods except arms, ammunition and implements of war, but not excluding other contraband, to belligerent and neutral ports other than in Europe or North Africa or east of 66° W. Long. and north of 35° N. Lat. (this excluded them from the St. Lawrence estuary and the port of Halifax, but allowed them to go to St. John, Yarmouth, Jamaica and the Caribbean, Vancouver and all belligerent ports in the Pacific and Indian oceans). They could carry any goods—except arms, ammunition and implements of war—to such ports without previous divesting of American title on leaving the United States.

(8) All goods shipped to European belligerent ports on foreign ships must first have their title transferred from American ownership, so that they might never be the source of spoliation claims of any citizen of the United States (this was in effect a pass-title-and-carry provision, not a "cash-and-carry" clause as popularly called).

(9) Like the Neutrality Act of 1937, the act of 1939 forbade "any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations" of a belligerent state, "or any person acting for or on behalf of any such state," but allowed dealing in old securities, issued previous to the act and did not prohibit "renewal or adjustment of existing indebtedness."

(10) Like the previous neutrality legislation, the Neutrality Act of 1939 provided for the licensing of all munitions exports in time of peace or war.

[Joint Resolution of Congress of Nov. 4, 1939 (Public Resolution No. 54, 76th Congress, 2nd Session, H. J. Res. 306), "To preserve the neutrality and the peace of the United States and to secure the safety of its citizens and their interests." For map of combat zone proclaimed by the President on Nov. 4, see Commerce Reports, No. 46 for Nov. 18, 1939, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Neutrality Acts of 1935, 1936 and 1937 represented an effort to reorient American neutrality⁹⁰ in anticipation of another conflict in the Old World. Taken together, the principal provisions of this legislation were: (1) prohibition, in time of war between foreign states, or of foreign "civil strife," of the export from the United States of "arms, ammunition or implements of war," as the same shall be defined by presidential proclamation, "to any port of such belligerent state, or to any neutral port for transshipment to, or the use of, a belligerent country," with the exception of an American republic at war with a non-American state and not co-operating with

a non-American state in such a war; (2) prohibition of loans or credits to a belligerent state (with the same exception) by an American national; (3) discretionary power to the President to forbid exportation on American ships to belligerent countries of articles or materials other than arms, ammunition or implements of warfare, and to forbid the exportation of any American property in such articles or materials in foreign ships (the so-called "cash-and-carry" feature limited to two years, which expired May 1, 1939); (4) government licensing and control of the munitions industry in time of peace and war; (5) power to the President to forbid to belligerent submarines or armed merchant ships the use of American neutral ports; (6) prohibition of the arming of American ships trading to belligerent countries.

Except for the first and second provisions, which were mandatory, the President retained a large measure of discretionary power in the execution of this act, and even these provisions were brought measurably under his discretion (a) by the power he had to decide what was or was not a war (he did not recognize the second Sino-Japanese War as a war within the meaning of the act, although he did so judge the Italo-Ethiopian War), (b) by phraseology which might exclude contiguous states like Mexico and Canada from the operation of the "cash-and-carry section."

After the outbreak of war in Europe on Sept. 1, 1939, this legislation was superseded by the Neutrality Act of 1939^{re}.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*; Edwin M. Borchard, *Neutrality*, in *Before America Decides*, edited by Frank P. Davidson and George F. Viereck, Jr.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Nevada, "snow-covered," was the thirty-sixth state admitted to the Union. Although this area was claimed by the Spaniards, in 1776, it was not explored by them. After Mexico came into possession of it, in 1820, trails were made across it by explorers, trappers, traders and emigrants. By the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo^{re}, 1848, it became a part of the United States. By the Compromise of 1850^{re}, the territories of Utah and New Mexico were organized on the principle of squatter sovereignty^{re}. Nevada was a part of both of these territories.

The first permanent settlement, Mormon Station, was made in 1851 by John Reese and a party of Mormons^{re} on the west side of Carson Valley. In 1854 the station was renamed Genoa, and made the county seat of Carson County, Utah Territory. A number of Mormons settled in

the neighboring valleys. In 1857 most of these settlers returned to Salt Lake City to fight in the Mormon War^{re}.

With the discovery of the Comstock Lode^{re} at Virginia City in 1859 large numbers of Californians settled in Carson County. Not wishing to be under Mormon rule, Congress was petitioned to create Nevada Territory out of western Utah, March 2, 1861. In 1862 and again in 1866 land was added to Nevada from Utah; in 1866 the western part of Arizona Territory was added to Nevada. The history of Nevada Territory was similar to other mining states. Problems peculiar to the territory were secession sentiment, corrupt officials, boundary disputes, lawlessness and mining litigation.

President Lincoln, wishing to insure the enactment of the Thirteenth Amendment^{re}, urged the admission of Nevada to secure three needed votes. Due to an unwise tax measure, the first constitution submitted, 1863, was rejected; a second one was approved and telegraphed to Lincoln, who proclaimed Nevada a state, Oct. 31, 1864.

From 1859-79 mining was the chief industry; from 1879-1900, cattle and sheep raising. After 1900 Nevada entered a new era in mining and agriculture. With the discovery of Tonopah, Goldfield, Ely and many other mining camps, the state again flourished from this source. Large areas of land have been reclaimed by the construction of Lahontan, Rye Patch and Boulder dams. Reno, Las Vegas and Ely are the largest cities.

Although Nevada supports educational, political, penal and charitable institutions, it has no state income, corporation, inheritance or sales taxes. Because the state has the largest per capita cash balance of any of the states (it owns its own bonds on which neither it nor any of its political subdivisions has ever defaulted) and because its per capita wealth is the highest in the Union, Nevada is known today as "One sound state."

[Effie Mona Mack, *Nevada*; James G. Scrugham, *A History of Nevada*.]

EFFIE MONA MACK

New Albion. See Plowden's New Albion.

New Amstel. See New Castle.

New Amsterdam was founded in July, 1625, when the little settlement planted by the Dutch West India Company^{re} on Nut (Governors^{re}) Island was transferred to the lower end of Manhattan. In accordance with the instructions of the company directors, a fort, pentagonal in shape, was built, and a street connecting the two gates was laid out, with a market place in the

center, houses around it to be used as offices for the company and homes for the director and members of his council. In 1626, because of Indian troubles, the families settled at Fort Orange^{er} were moved to New Amsterdam. Two roads, now known as Whitehall and Pearl streets, and two canals, now covered by the pavements of Broad and Beaver streets, formed the limits of the settlement. A wagon road led from the fort along the present Broadway, Park Row and Fourth Avenue up to about East 14th Street, east of which lay the five company farms and that of the director of the province.

The inhabitants of New Amsterdam had no voice in the government of the settlement, which was administered by the director of the province and his council, who were appointed by the directors of the company. Implicit obedience to the orders and laws of the company was expected. Life in New Amsterdam in the early years of the settlement was far from pleasant. The directors were autocratic, members of the council quarreled with the director and with each other. Jonas Michaelius, the first ordained minister to New Netherland^{er}, who arrived in 1628, was sharply critical of conditions. He declared the people oppressed, the food supply scarce, and many of the inhabitants loafers who needed to be replaced by competent farmers and industrious laborers. Housing conditions were little better than at the beginning of the settlement. Although the population then numbered 270 men, women and children, the majority of the people were still lodged in primitive huts of bark, huddled near the protecting ramparts of the fort.

In spite of difficulties the town grew and made progress. A new fort, girded with stone, was built. A barracks for the soldiers, a bakery and more houses for company servants were constructed; and a wooden church to replace the loft of the horse mill, in which Michaelius had held services, was begun. Shortly afterward a house for Domine Bogardus, who had succeeded Michaelius, was built.

In 1637 the brutal and unwise Indian policy of Director Willem Kieft resulted in an Indian war, which threatened to wipe out the settlement. Peace was made in 1645, but when Peter Stuyvesant arrived in 1646 to succeed Kieft, he found New Amsterdam in a state of complete demoralization. New ordinances were passed to curb drunkenness in the town (Domine Backerus reported seventeen taphouses). Three street surveyors were appointed to remedy the deplorable conditions of the houses, streets and fences; and steps taken to raise money to repair the fort, finish the church and build a school.

In 1652, as a result of much popular agitation, Stuyvesant was instructed to give New Amsterdam a "burgher government." Accordingly, in February of the following year, a schout, two burgomasters and five schepens were appointed. These officials together constituted a court, which met once a week, had both civil and criminal jurisdiction, and continued to function until merged in the supreme court of the State of New York in 1895. The magistrates met in the Stadt Huis, which had originally been built by Kieft as a tavern. At first Stuyvesant claimed the right to preside. In 1654 the magistrates received the power, if permitted by the council, to levy taxes and to convey lands. A painted coat of arms, a seal and a silver signet were delivered to them with impressive ceremonies. In 1658 they were allowed to nominate their successors, and two years later the company granted the separation of the office of city schout, an office which had previously combined the duties of sheriff, prosecutor and president of the magistrates. In 1657 burgher rights were granted, and from that time on no merchant could do business, or craftsman ply his trade, without admission to the freedom of the city by the magistrates.

In 1655 an Indian war again threatened the city, but after some show of force a truce was patched up. A census taken in 1656 showed 120 houses and 1000 inhabitants in the city. From the earliest days New Amsterdam had a cosmopolitan character, Father Jogues reporting in 1644 that eighteen different languages were spoken in or about the town. New Amsterdam passed into the hands of the English, becoming New York City^{er}, with the fall of New Netherland in 1664. After the recapture of the colony by the Dutch in 1673, it was called New Orange, then renamed New York after the restoration of the colony to England in 1674.

[Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer, *The History of the City of New York.*]
A. C. FLICK

New Buda. After the unsuccessful revolution in Hungary in 1848-49, many Hungarians fled to America. In 1850 a number of these exiles, under Count Ladislaus Ujházy, selected a tract of virgin prairie land in Decatur County, Iowa, near the Missouri border, which they named New Buda in honor of the Magyar capital of Hungary. Finding the Iowa climate unsuitable for raising grapes, Ujházy and some of the other settlers moved to Texas in 1853, but George Pomutz continued to promote settlement in New Buda, which he advertised as a "city," with parks, schools and public buildings. In 1858 Congress, by special act, extended the right of pre-emption

to the Hungarian exiles. Their culture and training, however, did not fit them for pioneer life. Some of them later returned home. A few remained in Iowa, but New Buda soon disappeared.

[Lillian May Wilson, Some Hungarian Patriots in Iowa, in *The Iowa Journal of History and Politics*, Vol. XI.]

RUTH A. GALLAHER

New Cæsarea or New Jersey^o were names given in the original deed of 1664 to territory leased to Berkeley and Carteret. The word Jersey is a corruption of *Czar's-ey*, or *Cæsar's-ey* (island of Cæsar). The hybrid form, New Cæsarea (or sometimes purified to the Latin *Nova Cæsarea*), was rarely used. The name was chosen to honor Carteret's defense of the Channel isle of Jersey (1649).

[F. B. Lee, *New Jersey as a Colony and as a State*, Vol. I.]

C. A. TITUS

New Castle (Del.) was founded by the Dutch in 1651 as Fort Casimir, following the abandonment of Fort Nassau^o (near Gloucester, N. J.). The Swedish Fort Christina^o (at present Wilmington) controlled the river trade with the Indians to the detriment of the Dutch at Fort Nassau. Fort Casimir was therefore established and became the key to the South or Delaware River. Differences between the Dutch and Swedes resulted in the surrender of Fort Casimir to the Swedish Capt. Johan Rising in May, 1654. The fort being captured on Trinity Sunday was renamed Fort Trefaldighet, or Fort Trinity. The following year a formidable force from New Amsterdam^o, under Peter Stuyvesant, recaptured it. This fort and all the other Swedish settlements in the Delaware River Valley were under the jurisdiction of the Dutch West India Company^o until 1656. Then Fort Casimir was transferred to the burgomasters of the city of Amsterdam and renamed New Amstel. With many difficulties the settlement continued under its new owners until 1664, when Sir Robert Carr, after aiding in the capture of New Amsterdam, arrived before New Amstel in September of the same year and demanded its surrender. The town was renamed New Castle by the Duke of York's^o representatives who continued to govern it (except for several months in 1673 when the Dutch regained control) until 1682. On Oct. 27, 1682, William Penn first landed on American soil at New Castle and received ownership of it and the surrounding territory from the Duke of York's agents. Under the Penn proprietorship, New Castle was the seat of the assembly of the Lower Counties^o, as well as the county seat

of New Castle County. With the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, New Castle remained the county seat and became the capital of the State of Delaware^o. Because of British invasion in 1777, the capital was removed to Dover.

[Amandus Johnson, *The Swedish Settlements on the Delaware*; Benjamin Ferris, *A History of the Original Settlements on the Delaware*.]

LEON DEVALINGER, JR.

"New Deal," an expression commonly used by card players, was first used publicly by Franklin D. Roosevelt on July 2, 1932, in his address accepting the Democratic presidential nomination. Subsequently, throughout his campaign for the Presidency, he frequently promised the country "a New Deal" if he were elected. During his aggressive campaign, Mr. Roosevelt sought to explain what he meant by his slogan. He spoke of the need for economic planning, for reorganization of governmental agencies, for the reduction of Federal expenditures, for agricultural improvement, for increased regulation of public utilities, for improving the condition of the railroads, for changes in the tariff, for judicial reform, for more efficient handling of the crime problem, for the regulation of banks, for the curbing of speculation, for increased regulation of holding companies, and for "National and International Unity." He endorsed the movement for the repeal of the prohibition^o amendment and he promised early legalization of the manufacture and sale of beer.

The program proposed to bring about "a New Deal" was far less drastic than "the New Deal" which was actually developed following the inauguration of President Roosevelt on March 4, 1933. At the time of the inauguration, the country was experiencing a bank panic which had begun about the middle of the previous February (*see* Banking Crisis of 1933). Because of the fear induced by the banking situation, it was possible to launch the far-reaching Federal program referred to as "the New Deal." Using an emergency^o justification in the hope of overcoming constitutional obstacles, President Roosevelt and his advisers proposed, and Congress approved, numerous drastic measures to deal with the situation.

During 1933 and 1934, the emergency program met with little effective opposition even though criticism was gradually increasing in volume. This first phase, often called the "First New Deal," came to an end when the Supreme Court, after two minor decisions in 1934, handed down twelve additional decisions adverse to the Rooseveltian program in 1935 and 1936. Undaunted by these blows which invalidated a number of

their key measures (*see* National Recovery Administration; Agricultural Adjustment Administration), the New Dealers proceeded to secure new congressional enactments to circumvent the decisions, at least in part (*see* National Labor Relations Act; Soil Conservation). This was the period of the "Second New Deal." Following the overwhelming victory of President Roosevelt in the elections of 1936, the so-called "Third New Deal" was inaugurated. This period, which lasted at least until the 1938 elections, was featured by a long drawn out but unsuccessful campaign to "pack" the Supreme Court⁷⁰ and to secure congressional authority for the Chief Executive to reorganize the Federal administrative agencies⁷¹. The "Third New Deal" was also featured by a severe economic "recession"⁷² beginning in the latter part of 1937, which undoubtedly helped bring about the political setback experienced by New Dealers at the polls in November, 1938.

The New Deal sought to promote many different specific objectives, all of which may, however, be combined into four general objectives: relief, recovery, reform and social security. To promote relief the New Dealers, among other measures, created the Federal Emergency Relief Administration⁷³ in 1933, followed by the work relief organizations, the Civil Works Administration⁷⁴ in 1933-34, the State Emergency Relief Administrations in 1934-35, and the Works Progress Administration⁷⁵ created in 1935. A form of work relief chiefly for young men was provided through the Civilian Conservation Corps⁷⁶ established in 1933. Relief to home owners and farmers faced by mortgage foreclosures was afforded through the Home Owners Loan Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration⁷⁷.

Recovery was promoted through "pump-priming" agencies such as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, created in 1932 on the recommendation of President Hoover; the Public Works Administration, set up in 1933; and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, established also in 1933⁷⁸. The National Recovery Administration, created on June 16, 1933, sought to promote business and industrial recovery while the Federal Housing Administration undertook to stimulate private loans to persons desiring to acquire their own houses⁷⁹.

While more or less reform was embodied in most of the New Deal measures, some parts of the program started in 1933 were chiefly designed to promote definite reforms. The Tennessee Valley Authority⁸⁰ was set up to develop a "yardstick" for measuring the cost of producing electricity and to serve as an experiment in economic planning. The Securities and Exchange

Commission⁸¹ was created in 1934 for the regulation of the sale of securities. Another notable reform measure was the 1935 law designed to regulate utility holding companies⁸². After the Supreme Court invalidated the compulsory code system of the National Recovery Administration, a number of important reform acts were adopted to provide at least a part of the regulation imposed by the codes. These included the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, the Guffey Coal Acts of 1935 and 1937, the 1936 Robinson-Patman Act designed to prevent price discriminations, the Walsh-Healey Act to compel government contractors to maintain approved labor standards, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 intended to regulate hours and wages and to curb child labor⁸³. The banking and money programs of the New Deal were also chiefly of a reform character.

The fourth objective was advanced by railroad pension legislation in 1934, 1935 and 1937; by a railroad unemployment insurance law of 1938; and, chiefly, by the National Social Security Act⁸⁴ of 1935. This last-mentioned act provided for Federal subsidies to the states for old-age assistance⁸⁵ and aid for unfortunates and dependents. A system of retirement annuities and unemployment insurance⁸⁶ was also provided by the act.

The chief criticism of the New Deal was directed at its methods which had the effect of greatly centralizing authority in the Federal Government and which, through congressional delegations of power⁸⁷, vastly extended the power of the President and Federal administrative agencies. Though it lost fourteen Supreme Court decisions prior to June, 1936, while winning only three, the New Deal, it is important to note, was uniformly successful before the highest tribunal during the following two years in which period its methods were upheld in over twenty-five decisions.

[Franklin D. Roosevelt, *Looking Forward* and *On Our Way*; Schuyler C. Wallace, *The New Deal in Action*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

"New Departure" Policy of the Democratic party, 1871, accepted the postwar constitutional amendments as ending war issues and sought Liberal Republican co-operation in opposing the Radicals⁸⁸. First proposed in formal resolution by C. L. Vallandigham at Dayton, Ohio, on May 18, it resembled a suggestion by Greeley in 1868. Eleven state Democratic conventions in the North and West endorsed the Dayton proposal. The New Departure paved the way

for the Democratic-Liberal Republican alliance of the campaign of 1872nd.

[J. L. Vollandigham, *Life of Clement L. Vollandigham*.]

CHARLES H. COLEMAN

New Echota, Treaty of, was signed Dec. 29, 1835, and proclaimed by President Jackson on May 23, 1836 For \$5,000,000 and 7,000,000 acres of land the Cherokees^{es} agreed to give up all their territory east of the Mississippi and remove to the West within two years (*see* Indian Removal). It was negotiated at the Cherokee capital, in northern Georgia, between William Carroll and John F. Schermerhorn, the United States commissioners, and the treaty faction of the Cherokees, headed by Stand Watie and John Ridge.

[J. P. Brown, *Old Frontiers, The Story of the Cherokee Indians from Earliest Times to the Date of Removal to the West, 1838*; U. B. Phillips, *Georgia and State Rights*; G. Foreman, *Indian Removal*.]

E. MERTON COULTER

New England, embracing the six states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, has from the beginning formed a distinct section with a character of its own. It is significant that New England first developed the idea of a complete separation of the colonies from Great Britain, that it opposed westward expansion of the country, and was the first to suggest secession from the Union (*see* Hartford Convention). This sectionalism, separatism and local character have many causes.

Geographically the section is largely cut off from the rest of the continent by the northern spurs of the Appalachian mountain range, with no river system, such as the Mohawk-Hudson, giving it access to the hinterland. Although in the period of early English settlement in all the colonies there was much of the Puritan outlook, New England was settled by the strictest of the sect, and in Massachusetts the government set up was a theocracy^{es} which, owing to the transfer of the charter, was practically independent of England for a half century. Connecticut and Rhode Island colonies never had royal governors. Owing to altered conditions in the home country, immigration^{es} practically ceased for two centuries after 1640. The early establishment of Harvard^{es}, though scarcely more than a grammar school, increased parochialism. Leaders who might have been broadened by going to Britain for their education remained in the narrow atmosphere of the colony. The poor soil and broken terrain prevented the development of large estates or staple crops, as well as of slavery.

The section became a land of small independent farmers as stubborn as their soil, of fishermen along the coast, and of traders overseas who, in the absence of furs or staple crops, had to be unusually ingenious in finding ways of making money.

There were local differences, such as the religious intolerance of Massachusetts and the freedom of Rhode Island, but in the period from 1630 to 1830, roughly, the New England, or "Yankee," character was becoming set in the section as a whole. The lack of fresh blood and of outside contacts, control by the clerical oligarchy, and methods of migration, were all factors of importance. The last was usually not by individuals but by groups of families or entire congregations "swarming" to some place where they would find better land. Everywhere, group solidarity helped to maintain customs and character.

The typical institutions of New England were thus developed almost in isolation—schools, the Congregational Church, town system of government, the "New England conscience" and preoccupation with religious and spiritual matters and causes. The opening of the Erie Canal^{es} to New York City, in 1825, isolated the section yet more, and for long, owing to characteristic insistence on short local lines, even its railroads did not link it to the nation. The training in mind, self-help and ingenuity, however, had developed the most skilled workmen in America, and the section developed manufactures, especially those calling for a high degree of individual skill, to an extent that no other section did. The growth of manufactures, however, appeared to call for an increase in cheap labor, and after 1840 foreign immigration was so great as to change largely the population and character. For example, Puritan Massachusetts is today overwhelmingly a Catholic state.

Nevertheless, the New England strain of character, set through its centuries of struggle and separatism, has persisted, and by migration contributed much to other sections. Chiefly in search of better lands, emigration has been constant. Among the earliest movements were those to eastern Long Island and New Jersey, even South Carolina. Later there were settlements in Pennsylvania, the Mohawk Valley, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon. There are towns and districts all across the northern United States which seem like transplanted bits of New England, and wherever the groups of settlers have gone they have carried the ideas of education, the Congregational (often now Presbyterian) Church, the township and town meeting^{es}, and

the peculiar and salutary flavor of the New England character and attitude. Sectional as it has been and remains, the influence of New England on the rest of the nation has been out of all proportion to its size and population

[J. T. Adams, *History of New England*; L. K. Mathews, *The Expansion of New England*; *New England's Prospect*, 1933, Am. Geog. Soc.]

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

New England, Dominion of (June, 1686–April, 1689), represented the application of a principle which the English government had long had in mind, the consolidation of the American colonies into a few large provinces for the sake of better administration of defense, commerce and justice. The experiment in dominion government was first tried out in New England because of the necessity of replacing the old charter government of Massachusetts Bay Colony^o, after the annulment of the charter in 1684, with some form of royal control. The dominion was established in June, 1686, in temporary form, under the presidency of a native New Englander, Joseph Dudley, but was formally inaugurated in December, 1686, upon the arrival of Gov. Edmund Andros, under whose rule the former colonies or regions of Massachusetts, Plymouth, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Maine, the County of Cornwall (northern Maine) and King's Province^o, a disputed region in southern New England, were consolidated into one province.

Governmental power was vested in the governor and a council, appointed by the king, but there was no representative assembly. Andros' strict administration of the Navigation Acts^o, his attempts to establish English land law, and above all the menace of taxation without representation (though taxation under him was not excessive in amount) drew all groups into opposition. To strengthen the line of defense against the French, New York and New Jersey were added to the dominion in 1688, making a unit too large for one man to administer well. Upon arrival of news that James II had abdicated, the Puritan leaders rose in revolt against Andros and overthrew him (April, 1689).

[V. F. Barnes, *The Dominion of New England*.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

New England, Hill Country of. With the removal of French and Indian alarms in 1760, settlement of the hill country of northern New England was rapid. A generation, necessarily versatile and alert, was able, from the forest, soil, forge, flocks and herds, to provide an abundance of all save iron and tax money. Small

grains and potatoes were produced, but only until farmers became established in livestock about 1800, since when all changes in production have been in animals and animal products sold. By 1820 thousands of cattle, hogs and sheep were annually driven in summer to Massachusetts markets, and, in winter, pork, beef and cheese were hauled to Montreal or Boston for cash or groceries.

Between 1820 and 1870 the merino sheep industry rose and fell. The boom in wool ended with the 1846 tariff, and Western and Australian competition. There followed a notable period of sheep breeding and improvement for Western markets. Population displaced by sheep went west and to Eastern industrial centers, though many commuted to neighboring water-driven mills, which temporarily came into being, to work up local wool, granite, marble, slate, iron and timber. The vast majority of those who went to the Civil War died in battle, or, with a veteran's restlessness, contracted the "western fever." The tariff of 1862 and railway development brought mass production^o. This, not the cider, whiskey, pie and fried potatoes the natives allegedly ate, destroyed local industries. Hill communities became a "good place to be born in and go away from."

After 1870 gloom settled on the hills. Men could not compete with the West or Australia in sheep or cattle, with Iowa in butter, or the industrial cities in manufactures. Population declined, taxes mounted, and the cost of raising those who, on growing up, migrated, and of caring for the aged proved onerous. Lumbering was overdone. Mills by waterfalls became ruins and memories. Folk turned, without enthusiasm or success, to dairying and fruit raising. Because cattle did not fertilize pastures as sheep had done, many fields were abandoned to forest.

Since 1900 forest extension has continued. Maple syrup now pays many a farmer's taxes, and summer tourists and winter sports add to the prosperity of numerous hill towns. Apple orchards have grown. But dairying has developed into the major industry, the milk being shipped whole to Boston, where the profits largely remain in the hands of the milk companies. Men still sigh for the good old days when one breeder refused \$10,000 for a ram.

[H. F. Wilson, *The Hill Country of Northern New England*; Vt. Agric. Experimental Station, *Thirteen Hill Towns*, being Land Utilization Bulletin 357, 1933.]

J. S. PRENTICE

New England Almanack. Almanacs^o appeared continuously in New England from 1639 on,

with varying titles, including the *Boston Ephemeris* (1683), *Cambridge Ephemeris* (1684) and, finally, *The New-England Almanack for 1686*, published at Cambridge by Samuel Green, Sr., and compiled by Samuel Danforth. The first long series of almanacs was compiled by John Tulley and published for the years 1687 to 1702, the next being Samuel Clough's, from 1700 to 1708. The eighty almanacs printed in Massachusetts up to 1700 constituted four fifths of the nonofficial and nonreligious literature of the time. Beginning with little more than astronomical calculations, they gradually added agricultural and household information, anecdotes, moral observations, bits of history and biography, wise and witty sayings. The almanac was the most popular secular literature of New England for two centuries and the old *Farmer's Almanac*⁹⁰, begun in 1793, is still a best seller.

[C. L. Nichols, *Notes on the Almanacs of Massachusetts*.]

R. W. G. VAIL

New England Antislavery Society, THE, founded at Boston, 1832, later known as the Massachusetts Antislavery Society, was the parent body in America organized upon the principle of the immediate abolition⁹¹ of slavery without compensation to slaveholders. Uncompromising in language, eschewing political action, and partial to many of the then considered un-American "isms" of the day, its members nevertheless revitalized the antislavery movement⁹². Hostile to the use of physical violence, the Society lived to see slavery abolished in the United States after a bloody civil war.

[A. B. Hart, ed., *Commonwealth History of Massachusetts*, Vol. 4.]

LLOYD G. M. HARE

New England Company (1628-29) was the successor to the Dorchester Company⁹³ which began settlement of the Massachusetts Bay region, and precursor to the Massachusetts Bay Company⁹⁴. The New England Company came into existence as an attempt to revive the dying Dorchester plantation, which had originated chiefly as a fishing venture, but which had failed to establish a strong settlement. A new group of men, interested primarily in making a plantation for religious purposes, took over the Dorchester enterprise, then applied to the Council for New England⁹⁵ for a patent, which they are reputed to have received under date of March 19, 1628. The New England Company thus formed was an unincorporated, joint-stock affair, like so many which had attempted plantations under patents from trading companies⁹⁶ but, under the leadership of John White, there

was from the first a strong Puritan influence in the enterprise. With funds subscribed the company despatched a fleet with prospective settlers and supplies, and appointed John Endecott as governor of the tiny settlement already existing at Naumkeag (later Salem). Within the company doubts arose concerning the efficacy of their patent, which made the members decide to seek royal confirmation. Supported by important men at court, they succeeded in their endeavor and were able thenceforth to proceed in their project under the royal charter of March 4, 1629, which released them from further dependence upon the Council for New England.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period in American History*, Vol. I.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

New England Confederation. See United Colonies of New England.

New England Council. See Council for New England.

New England Council, THE, is a regional economic research and development organization, created in 1925 by the six New England governors and 600 representatives of New England industrial, agricultural and commercial associations, and other business leaders. It is dedicated to the active promotion of New England's economic welfare, particularly in the fields of industry, recreation and agriculture, and to the preservation of that spirit of democracy conceived in the New England Town Meeting. It sponsors the annual New England Conference in co-operation with the six New England governors who participate in the proceedings.

[Oliver McKee, *New England Comes Back United*, *Nation's Business*, November, 1938; Robert E. Huse, *Regional Development and the New England Council*, *Public Opinion Quarterly*, July, 1938, Stewart Holbrook, *The Yanks Are Coming—Back*, *Saturday Evening Post*, Sept. 23, 1939.]

WALLACE DICKSON

New England Emigrant Aid Company, THE (1854-66), an important factor in the Kansas conflict and in the rise of the Republican party⁹⁷, was first incorporated by Eli Thayer, April 26, 1854. Its plan of operations was to advertise Kansas, send emigrants in conducted parties at reduced transportation rates, and invest its capital in improvements in Kansas, from which it hoped to earn a profit. It sent to Kansas about 2000 settlers who founded all the important Free State towns. It established ten mills and two hotels, and assisted schools and churches. It aided the Free State party⁹⁸ in various ways, and its officers sent the first Sharps rifles⁹⁹. It raised and

spent, including rents and sales, about \$190,000. Its activities furnished the pretext for the fraudulent voting by Missourians. It was blamed by President Pierce, Stephen A. Douglas, and the proslavery leaders for all the troubles in Kansas. Although the company failed financially, its friends believed it had saved Kansas from slavery. After the Civil War it undertook unsuccessful colonization projects in Oregon and Florida.

[L. W. Spring, *Kansas, the Prelude to the War for the Union*; Eli Thayer, *A History of the Kansas Crusade*.]

SAMUEL A. JOHNSON

New-England Primer, The, first published about 1690, combined lessons in spelling with the Shorter Catechism and with versified injunctions to piety and to faith in Calvinistic fundamentals. Crude couplets and woodcut pictures illustrated the alphabet. Here first was published the child's prayer, "Now I lay me down to sleep." This eighty-page booklet, four and a half by three inches in size, was for a half century the only elementary textbook, and for a century more it held a central place in infant education. It is one of the most important colonial American cultural documents.

[P. L. Ford, *The New-England Primer*; C. F. Heartman, *The New England Primer . . . A Bibliographical Checklist*.]

HARRY R. WARFEL

"**New England Way**," THE, referred to the ecclesiastical polity, its relation to the civil powers, and the practices of the Massachusetts Bay Colony churches, and sometimes, indiscriminately, to those of Connecticut or Rhode Island^{er}. Intended to prove that "Discipline out of the Word" enforced by godly magistrates was possible, Massachusetts considered her churches as examples for Puritan^{er} reconstruction of the English Church. English reformers inquired into the system (1637), and after the Long Parliament began ecclesiastical "reform" (1641), interest in Massachusetts polity led John Cotton, among others, to expound it in *The Way of the Churches of Christ in New England* . . . (1645), a short title for which ("The New England Way") made permanent an expression already common. Originally a platform of opposition to English prelacy, based upon teachings of Henry Jacob, William Ames, and others, the "New England Way," immature in the 1640's, developed into New England Congregationalism^{er}. The church, originating neither in princes nor parliaments but in God's Word, was a body of professed regenerates ("the elect") who subscribed to a "Covenant" (or creed), selected officers, chose and ordained its minister, was sub-

ject to no interchurch organizations save "con-sociations" for counsel and advice. Being "visible saints," their church door was narrow, and admitted only persons who approved the covenant and whose piety and deportment recommended them to the congregation. They denied separation from the Anglican Church^{er}; they separated only from its "Corruptions," considered themselves true "primitive churches of Christ," and were supremely intolerant of others. Magistrates, "nursing fathers of the churches," were limited in civil authority by the "Word" (in practice, as interpreted by ministers), and compelled both to conformity and to purge churches and state of heterodoxy. Citizenship depended upon church membership. Church and state were indissolubly united. The "New England Way" did not appeal to English Independents whose multiple sects required embracing toleration, nor to Presbyterians^{er} whose synods held great interchurch authority, nor to parliamentarians who required the church to be subject to parliamentary prerogative. Thus, in many particulars, the "New England Way" was impracticable as an English model, and New England Congregationalists parted company with their English brethren.

[Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts*; Benjamin Hanbury, ed., *Historical Memorials Relating to the Independents and Congregationalists from Their Rise to the Restoration*.]

RAYMOND P. STEARNS

"**New Era**" or "New Economic Era" was a term used contemporaneously to describe the period just before the great depression began in 1929. Not only was it believed that the country had entered an era of high wages and prices, "easy" credit and satisfactory profits but apparently it was the belief of those who used the expression that the conditions which they regarded as ideal would continue indefinitely. Those who spoke of the "New Era" failed to realize the dangers in the current stock-market speculation, and they ignored unsatisfactory conditions in agriculture and certain other phases of economic activity.

[A. M. Schlesinger, *Political and Social Growth of the United States, 1852-1933*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

New France. For a century after the discovery of America the kings of France, preoccupied with dynastic and civil wars, devoted little attention to New World enterprises. In 1524 Francis I sent out Verrazano, whose expedition provided a paper claim to much of North America, while the three expeditions of Cartier (1534-42) served to fix French attention upon the region

adjoining the Gulf of St. Lawrence. The short peace which Henry IV afforded the distracted country (1598-1610) made possible the first permanent French establishment in America (Quebec, 1608). For over half a century the government followed the policy of granting the colony to various companies to exploit, and despite the splendid devotion of Champlain, the "Father of New France," its growth was painfully slow.

In 1663 Louis XIV assumed direct control of the colony and a notable renaissance ensued. Soldiers were sent out to defend it and maidens to supply it with homes. Numerous measures looking to its economic betterment were instituted, and the Iroquois⁹⁹, whose warfare had been a nightmare hitherto, were thoroughly humbled. These things prepared the way for a remarkable geographical expansion whereby the boundaries were extended over the Great Lakes and the entire Mississippi Valley—the work of St. Luson, Jolliet, LaSalle, Hennepin, Duluth⁹⁹ and others.

The revolution of 1688 which placed William III on the English throne initiated the second Hundred Years' War between France and England. To Old-World rivalries the colonies added their own, and the period 1689-1763 witnessed four world wars, in each of which the American colonies participated. The long conflict ended with the surrender of Canada to England (Montreal, Sept. 8, 1760), while the remainder of New France was divided between England and Spain (see Paris, The Treaty of, 1763, Fontainebleau, Treaty of).

New France as a political entity thus ceased to exist. Upon both Canada and the United States, however, the colony has left an indelible influence, while the French race and culture remain permanently seated in the valley of the St. Lawrence.

[Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doughty, eds., *Canada and Its Provinces: A History of the Canadian People and Their Institutions by One Hundred Associates*; Geo. M. Wrong and H. H. Langton, eds., *Chronicles of Canada*; Francis Parkman, *Works*.]

M. M. QUAIFFÉ

New Freedom, THE, is a term generally accepted as descriptive of the political and economic philosophy underlying the domestic policies of President Wilson at the opening of his first administration. The more significant utterances of Mr. Wilson in the campaign of 1912⁹⁹ were published under the above title early in 1913. They constituted an earnest plea for a more humanitarian spirit in government and business, political reforms which would restore government to the people and break the power

of selfish and privileged minorities. The growth of corporate power had, he argued, rendered obsolete many traditional concepts of American democracy. Government must have not merely a negative, but a positive, program and use its power "to cheer and inspirit our people with the sure prospects of social justice and due reward, with the vision of the open gates of opportunity for all."

[R. S. Baker, *Life and Letters of Woodrow Wilson*.]
W. A. ROBINSON

New Frontier, THE, is a term sometimes applied to the various problems of adjustment that face the United States, now that the geographic frontier has disappeared. Writers and speakers who employ the term usually insist that traditional American ideals, based upon pioneer experience, should determine the spirit in which new problems are met.

[Guy Emerson, *The New Frontier*.]

JOHN D. HICKS

New Granada, Treaty of (1846). See Bidlack-Mallarino Treaty of 1846.

New Hampshire. Its brief coast and Isles of Shoals⁹⁹ were visited by many fishermen in the 16th century. In 1603 Martin Pring sailed up the Piscataqua; Champlain landed there in 1605, as did John Smith in 1614, whose *Description of New England* gave wide publicity to the region. The Council for New England⁹⁹ granted much of what is Maine and New Hampshire, in 1622, to Sir Ferdinando Gorges⁹⁹ and Capt. John Mason, and in 1629 regranted to Mason alone an area which he called New Hampshire. Later grants added to the Mason title⁹⁹. Under smaller grants from the Council, David Thomson settled at Odiorne's Point near Portsmouth in 1623, the first settlement in New Hampshire, and soon after Edward Hilton founded Dover. The Laconia Company settled Strawberry Bank⁹⁹ as a trading post in 1630. Rev. John Wheelwright with other religious dissenters from Massachusetts founded Exeter, and Massachusetts encouraged the settlement of Hampton in 1639. These four towns were practically independent, but weak. Massachusetts, disliking their Anglican or Antinomian⁹⁹ tendencies, laid claim to the region, holding "3 miles north of the Merrimac" to mean its source, and assumed control in 1641, making some religious concessions, especially in voting requirements. There was little religious persecution in New Hampshire, and no witchcraft trial, but several Quakers⁹⁹ were hanged in 1659-60. Farming, lumbering, shipbuilding, fishing and the fur trade were the chief occupations. No Indian troubles developed till King Philip's

War^m, but only one more town was settled by 1675.

Mason's heirs succeeded in 1679 in having New Hampshire created a separate royal province, with governor and council chosen by the crown, and an elected assembly. It was again ruled by Massachusetts for a time after the fall of Andros (*see* New England, Dominion of), becoming separate permanently in 1692, although having the same governor, 1699-1741. The boundary with Massachusetts was settled by the king in 1741. Soon after conflict developed with New York over the western line, and New Hampshire granted out 138 towns, the New Hampshire Grants^m, in what is now Vermont. The king settled this line in 1764.

Severe Indian attacks, as at Salmon Falls^m, Exeter and Durham between 1689 and 1725, slowed up settlement. Immigration was chiefly from Massachusetts and Connecticut, with an important group after 1719 in the Scotch-Irish^m. After the wars the province grew rapidly. By 1776 about 80,000 persons were living along the coast, inland to the Merrimac and in the west along the Connecticut. The northern half of New Hampshire was still unsettled, and much of the rest so recently occupied as to be under frontier conditions. Portsmouth, the capital, was the only town of size and wealth. Economic differences were not great, and the colony was distinctly rural, provincial and democratic. The first newspaper, the *New Hampshire Gazette*, was founded in 1756, and Dartmouth College^m in 1769.

The Revolution found few of the people Tories^m. The majority, after an attack on Fort William and Mary^m in 1774, drove out Gov. Wentworth, and created a new government in January, 1776, the first of the colonies to do so. New Hampshire regiments contributed their share; scores of privateers^m sailed from Portsmouth; three ships of the new navy were launched on the Piscataqua; Gen. Stark won the battle of Bennington^m (1777) with local troops. The economic distress after the war produced at Exeter a mild copy of the efforts of Daniel Shays^m, and a close contest in the ratification of the Constitution^m, which was finally secured June 21, 1788, as the ninth and decisive state. For some time New Hampshire was Federalist^m, but a rising Republican (Jeffersonian) party^m under John Langdon won many state elections, prevented participation in the Hartford Convention^m, and passed the Toleration Act of 1819. Manhood suffrage had been secured by the constitution of 1784. A Democratic machine fashioned by Isaac Hill carried New Hampshire for Jackson, and retained control till 1855, while the rest of New

England was usually with the opposition. Its peak was the election of Franklin Pierce in 1852. Since then the state has been generally Republican^m, and for some decades after the Civil War was under the domination of the railroads.

The 19th century saw many economic changes. Factories were built in many places, especially at Manchester, where the Amoskeag Company had the largest cotton mill in the world. After 1920 cotton manufacturing declined, and was replaced by a more diversified industry. Agriculture suffered from Western competition after 1825, knew a boom time with the merino sheep, and changed again toward the end of the century to dairying and truck farming. Lumbering is still important, although far less so. A resort and recreation business has become of great value. The population has grown more slowly than the rest of New England, and many towns have fewer inhabitants than they had a century ago. The nearly pure Anglo-Saxon stock has had added to it many other racial groups, the most numerous being the French Canadians. New Hampshire was hit less badly than most states by the depression after 1929^m, in part because of the large rural population and the diversification of its economic life.

[J. Belknap, *History of New Hampshire*; F. B. Sanborn, *New Hampshire*; E. S. Stackpole, *History of New Hampshire*; R. F. Upton, *Revolutionary New Hampshire*; W. H. Fry, *New Hampshire as a Royal Province*.]

HERBERT W. HILL

New Hampshire Grants. This term was applied in the early settlement to that section of territory now known as the State of Vermont. Benning Wentworth, first governor of New Hampshire, which colony claimed jurisdiction over the territory, began granting land to the settlers in 1749 in the name of the king of England. The first of the grants bore the name of Bennington. By 1761 the grants began to be issued rapidly, and a total of 131 townships had been chartered by 1764. At this point New York, which had set up counterclaims to the territory, with the attendant right to make grants, gained the support of the crown, and in 1765 began to charter townships within the grants, some of which conflicted with grants already made by New Hampshire. New York contended that the prior titles were invalidated, and the historic controversy between the settlers and the government of New York was born (*see* "Green Mountain Boys").

[W. H. Crockett, *History of Vermont*.]

LEON W. DEAN

New Harmony Settlement, THE, of Posey County, Ind., was founded in 1825 by Robert

Owen, the English philanthropist and industrialist, on the site previously occupied by the Harmony Society⁹⁰ of Pennsylvania. Here Owen attempted to put into practice the theories of socialism and human betterment he had evolved. By December, 1825, New Harmony had attracted a heterogeneous population of about 1000 men, women and children of all sorts and conditions. Following a preliminary organization, the constitution of "The New Harmony Community of Equality" was adopted Feb. 5, 1826. This provided for absolute equality of property, labor and opportunity together with freedom of speech and action. The absence of any real authority in the community government resulted in virtual anarchy, and after several abortive attempts to better conditions, Owen admitted the failure of the experiment on May 26, 1827. A number of communities modeled on New Harmony which sprang up in other states at this time were equally short-lived.

[G. B. Lockwood, *The New Harmony Communities, and The New Harmony Movement.*]

EDGAR B. NIXON

New Haven Colony, THE. Dissatisfied with government by king and council and with growing high-church Anglicanism in England, in the spring of 1637 John Davenport, Puritan divine, and Theophilus Eaton, merchant, led a group of Londoners to Massachusetts Bay. Both Davenport and Eaton were members of the Massachusetts Bay Company⁹¹ and probably intended to found a plantation within the limits of the Bay Colony, where the group already had many friends. They were sympathetic to the principles of Congregationalism⁹², to the attempt to limit political privileges to members of Congregational churches, and to "Moses his judicials,"⁹³ a code of laws recently prepared by John Cotton for Massachusetts and at the moment under consideration in that colony. They intended to found a commercial settlement, however, and by 1637 the best harbors of Massachusetts had been occupied. Moreover, at the time of their arrival the Antinomian controversy⁹⁴ was at its height in Massachusetts, and must have discouraged a group of Puritans⁹⁵ seeking a new Jerusalem. Finally, the Pequot War⁹⁶ had cleared the territory on the northern shore of Long Island Sound of Indians, and glowing reports of this region had reached Massachusetts. In the fall of 1637 Theophilus Eaton and others set out to investigate this "promised land," and as a result of their explorations, the group decided to settle at Quinnipiac, later known as the town of New Haven.

With recruits gained in Massachusetts, the

Davenport-Eaton company set out for Quinnipiac in the spring of 1638. They soon attracted kindred souls from Massachusetts, from Wethersfield on the Connecticut River, and from England. In addition to the town of New Haven, settlements appeared at Guilford, Milford, Stamford, Southold on Long Island, and, somewhat later, Branford. Without royal charter authorizing them to take possession of the soil and to organize a government, the settlers purchased land from the natives. In each town a church was gathered according to Congregational principles, and, following the gathering of a church, a plantation government based upon the Cotton Code (*see above*), adapted to meet the needs of a new and smaller community, was established. At first Guilford and Milford were independent plantations but Stamford, Southold and Branford acquired their land from New Haven and always recognized the jurisdiction of the mother town. As a result of the formation of the United Colonies of New England⁹⁷ in 1643, a colonial government, also based upon the Cotton Code, was established, and the New Haven Colony took its place as the smallest of the Puritan colonies of New England. Of this colony, Theophilus Eaton was governor until his death in 1658. Throughout the existence of the colony, political privileges were restricted to members of Congregational churches. To train leaders for church and state, John Davenport endeavored to found a colony grammar school and college at New Haven. A grammar school opened its doors in 1660 but closed two years later. The college of which Davenport dreamed did not materialize until long after his death (*see Yale University*).

During the early years of the colony the leaders had high hopes of establishing a commercial commonwealth which would extend from the western boundary of Saybrook⁹⁸ to the Delaware River. As early as 1641 they acquired title to land on the Delaware from the Indians. These plans brought the New Haven Colony into conflict with New Sweden and New Netherland⁹⁹. Probably more than the other colonies of New England, the Puritans on Long Island Sound desired the English conquest of New Netherland. The first Anglo-Dutch War seemed to further their designs but Massachusetts, not yet awakened to the possibility of extending her territory across the continent, balked the plans of the merchants of the New Haven Colony and Connecticut in 1653, and the end of the war in Europe halted an expedition which Oliver Cromwell had sent across the Atlantic to seize New Netherland in 1654. Hemmed in by Connecticut and the Dutch, the New Haven Colony

failed to develop into the great commercial commonwealth its founders had envisaged, and turned to agriculture.

The Restoration in England found the New Haven Colony without a leader capable of representing it at the court of Charles II. William Leete, governor, suggested that John Winthrop the Younger, about to visit England to secure a royal charter for Connecticut^o, procure one charter under which two colonial governments might function. Winthrop succeeded in securing a charter which unquestionably included the New Haven Colony, and, disregarding Leete's suggestion of two colonies, the magistrates of Connecticut hastened to extend their authority over their southern neighbor. The New Haven Colony fought absorption, but a royal grant of the territory between the Connecticut and Delaware rivers to James, Duke of York (*see* York's, Duke of, Proprietary), and the surrender of New Netherland to royal commissioners convinced the leaders that they would be better off under Connecticut than as part of the province of the Duke of York, and, reluctantly, in December, 1664, the New Haven Colony ceased to exist.

[I. M. Calder, *The New Haven Colony*.]

ISABEL M. CALDER

New Hope Church, Battles at (May 24-28, 1864). While battling his way toward Atlanta^o, Gen. Sherman (U.) attempted to pass to the right of the Confederate Army, but J. E. Johnston, the opposing commander, detected the movement and blocked it in a series of sharp fights in the forests around New Hope Church. Losses on each side were about 3000 men.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

New Ironsides, built in Philadelphia in 1861-62, was a screw sloop of the British *Warrior* type. She was 232 feet long, had a speed of 6 knots, and was protected by 4½ inches of rolled iron armor sloping at 17° and extending 3 feet below the water line. Sixteen 11-inch Dahlgren smoothbores and two 8-inch Parrott rifles were her chief armament. She took part in all the attacks in Charleston^o harbor in 1863 and was hit many times, even by a torpedo (*see* "Davids"), without damage. After assisting at Fort Fisher^o, she was laid up at League Island, where she was destroyed by fire in 1866.

[F. M. Bennett, *Steam Navy of the United States*.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

New Jersey. With the grant of New Netherland^o by Charles II to the Duke of York^o, that

portion located between the Hudson and Delaware rivers was conveyed by the latter, through a deed of lease and release, to John Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret as joint proprietors (June 23, 24, 1664). By the terms of this conveyance the province was "hereafter to be called . . . New Cæsarea^o or New Jersey" and boundaries were fixed as at present. Assuming powers of government the proprietors drew up the Concessions and Agreement^o and appointed Philip Carteret governor. Carteret chose for his capital Elizabethtown^o and called his first assembly in May, 1668. Berkeley's western portion now passed, first to John Fenwick and Edward Byllynge (1674), and later to Quaker interests headed by William Penn, who secured a division of the province into East Jersey and West Jersey^o (1676). The latter division became a refuge for persecuted Quakers^o, who founded the towns of Salem and Burlington^o, while the former, offered at auction by Carteret's heirs, was purchased by Penn and twenty-three associates for £3400 (1682). In East Jersey, settled mainly by Puritans from Long Island and New England, proprietary government was resisted, especially in Elizabethtown and the towns of the Monmouth Purchase^o, which held their patents from Gov. Nicolls of New York. After the fall of the Dominion of New England^o, during which the Jerseys were joined to New England (August, 1688-April, 1689), proprietary authority disintegrated and, with the surrender of their government to the crown (1702), the two divisions were reunited.

Until 1738 New Jersey was joined with New York under one governor, but retained its own assembly. This body, though chosen by restricted suffrage, was usually aligned against the governor and council, which represented the important landed and mercantile interests. Agriculture was the chief occupation and, especially in West Jersey where the farms were large, slavery existed despite the exhortations of John Woolman. As the conflict with England approached, the refusal of Gov. William Franklin to have delegates sent to the Continental Congress^o (1774) led to the meeting of a committee at New Brunswick for that purpose. From this committee grew the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, which assumed authority in all branches of government (May, 1775). Meeting at Burlington it elected the delegates to the Continental Congress (June 22, 1776) who signed the Declaration of Independence^o, adopted a state constitution (July 2) and, after taking the name "The Convention of the State of New Jersey," declared the state independent (July 18). To New

Jersey the Revolution was a terrible ordeal the people were divided in their sympathies; the state lay in the path of armies contesting for control of the Hudson and Delaware rivers. The victories at Trenton (Dec. 26, 1776) and Princeton (Jan. 3, 1777), imparting new vigor to the American cause, and the battle of Monmouth (June 28, 1778) are numbered among the important battles of the war, while the hardships of the Continental army at Morristown are only matched by Valley Forge⁹⁹. In the Convention of 1787⁹⁹ William Paterson introduced the New Jersey Plan and, later, at Trenton, the state convention unanimously ratified the new Federal Constitution (Dec. 18, 1787). That city was made the permanent state capital in 1790.

By 1840 the state had reflected the improvements in transportation in progress in the nation through the construction of over 500 miles of gravel and dirt road, completion of the Delaware and Raritan and Morris canals⁹⁹, and the building of its first railway, the Camden and Amboy Railroad (1833). In navigation John Stevens had introduced the screw propeller (1804) and had established the first steam ferry, between Hoboken and New York (1811). Favoring compromise in the slavery controversy, New Jersey gave Lincoln four of her seven electoral votes (1860). In 1889 the legislature enacted the first general holding-corporation law in America. Thereafter, the state's liberal incorporation and tax laws attracted a flood of big business enterprises, won for it the opprobrious title "Mother of Trusts" and led to the enactment, under Gov. Wilson, of seven antimonopoly laws (the "Seven Sisters") designed to end corporate benevolence (Feb. 19, 1913). With 80% of her population urbanized, the problems of New Jersey in the 20th century have become increasingly those of a highly industrialized community. The present state constitution, four times amended (1875, 1897, 1927, 1939), was adopted in 1844.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, Vol. III, A. D. Mellick, *The Story of an Old Farm*; F. B. Lee, *New Jersey as a Colony and as a State*.]

C. A. TITUS

New Jersey, Councils of the Proprietors of. The original proprietors of New Jersey were John Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret. With their approval, Gov. Carteret appointed seven councilors (February, 1665). This appointive Council of New Jersey, having executive and legislative powers, provided the model for an upper chamber in East Jersey⁹⁹ and, later, in the royal province, until the Revolution. In West Jersey⁹⁹ John Fenwick was chief proprietor

of his Salem "tenth" until March 1, 1682, while William Penn and his Quaker associates acted as trustee-proprietors in the remainder of that province. Under Penn's "Laws, Concessions and Agreements"⁹⁹ (March 3, 1677) all resident freeholders became proprietors, they elected a governing council annually. With the sale and subdivision of Carteret's original share (1682) the proprietors of East Jersey were increased to twenty-four. In each division, as the number of proprietaries increased, a council or board for the management of purely proprietary affairs was established. The Council of Proprietors of West Jersey, numbering nine members, was formed in 1688; the Board of Proprietors of East Jersey, including all resident proprietors, was created in 1684. Both decided policies concerning purchase and distribution of lands and managed undeeded lands, the East Jersey Council also directed the commercial development of that province and built Perth Amboy⁹⁹. Both councils still exist.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, Vol. III.]

C. A. TITUS

New Jersey Company, Associates of. In April, 1804, a group of New York lawyers, headed by Anthony Dey, completed the purchase of the land and ferry at Paulus Hook (Jersey City), N. J. With prominent citizens of Newark and New York they formed a development company capitalized at \$100,000. A bill drawn by Alexander Hamilton, incorporating this company as the "Associates of the Jersey Company," was passed by the legislature Nov. 10, 1804. For fifteen years the company governed the town; its influence lasted until 1838.

[C. H. Winfield, *A Monograph on the Founding of Jersey City*.]

C. A. TITUS

New Jersey Land Riots, THE, began in 1745 and extended over nine years. The first two occurred at Newark, the last one in Hunterdon County. The general cause was disputed land claims. Many persons held lands under doubtful titles, some were ejected by law, others imprisoned for resisting proprietary surveys. Rioting consisted mainly in breaking open jails and releasing prisoners. Rioters included both leading citizens and persons on the frayed edges of society. Their organizations dominated the assembly and influenced two successive governors. The American Revolution definitely closed the controversy.

[H. L. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. IV; E. J. Fisher, *New Jersey as a Royal Province*; New Light on the Famous Controversy in the

History of Elizabethtown, in New Jersey Historical Society, *Proceedings*, II.]

DONALD R. ALTER

New Jersey Plan, THE. See Convention of 1787.

New Lights. George Whitefield, appearing in New England in 1740, gave impetus to a religious reaction led by Jonathan Edwards^m toward the old doctrine of sanctification by faith alone. This became a cult known as the New Lights, which split the Congregational^m establishment in New England and drew from other faiths also. It brought on a religious revival known as the "Great Awakening,"^m with extravagant demonstrations—shoutings, contortions of face and body—the first of the sort in our history. Connecticut, where the controversy was violent, passed a law in 1742 to restrain the revivalists. Many New Light leaders, including Edwards, eventually had to leave their parishes.

[G. P. Fisher, *History of Christian Doctrine*; F. H. Foster, *A Genetic History of the New England Theology*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

New London, The Burning of. On the morning of Sept. 6, 1781, a British fleet from New York landed Gen. Benedict Arnold and about 800 men near New London, Conn. Fort Trumbull was quickly taken and most of the warehouses and residences of the town were burned. The British withdrew the same evening. The attack on Fort Griswold occurred simultaneously.

[F. M. Caulkins, *History of New London*; D. H. Hurd, *History of New London County*.]

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

New Madrid (Mo.) was founded by a group of Americans under the leadership of George Morgan in 1789. Spain hoped to make Louisiana a buffer state between the United States and Mexico by settling it with discontented Americans (see Western Separatism). Morgan represented the discontent over the failure of the Confederation^m to bring order and prosperity, and many of the Westerners who went with him did so because of the closure of the Mississippi by Spain which made it difficult for residents of Kentucky and the upper Ohio to market their products (see Mississippi River, Free Navigation of). Morgan's grant, made to him by Diego Gardoqui, Spanish minister to the United States, subject to the approval of the Spanish king, included the territory between Cape Cinque Hommes (Mo.) and the mouth of the St. Francis River (Ark.). Morgan himself led a party of seventy settlers and numerous Indians in four armed boats into Spanish territory early in 1789, and began the town on its present site. He took

great pains to make his city beautiful, and adopted a policy of advanced religious toleration, to the discomfort of the Spanish authorities. His Indian policy, also, was of a very liberal sort. Soon after getting his colony started he returned to the Eastern seaboard, by way of New Orleans where he had a discouraging interview with the Spanish governor, Miró. He never returned to New Madrid. Administration of the colony was taken over by the Spanish authorities, and a modification of Spanish policy with regard to the Mississippi, inspired by Gen. James Wilkinson, had the effect of discouraging American immigration until after the Louisiana Purchase^m.

[Max Savelle, *George Morgan, Colony Builder*; Louis Houck, ed., *The Spanish Régime in Missouri*; Arthur P. Whitaker, *The Spanish-American Frontier, 1783-1795*.]

MAX SAVELLE

New Market, Battle of (May 15, 1864). Moving down the Shenandoah Valley from Winchester, Sigel (U.) engaged the combined Confederate forces of Imboden and Breckinridge at New Market, Va. The engagement, fought in a driving rain, resulted in a Confederate victory, important in that it afforded Lee (C.) the opportunity of concentrating all his resources to the defense of Richmond.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

New Mexico. Alvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca, one of the castaways on the Texas coast of the Pánfilo de Narváez expedition^m, 1528-36, was probably the first white man to see New Mexico. Equally important was the reconnaissance of Fray Marcos de Niza in 1539, which led to Coronado's expedition^m, 1540-42. Coronado conquered the pueblos at Zuñi, July 7, 1540, and his captains proceeded to explore the surrounding country, finding the province of the Hopi Indians, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River and the fertile province of Tiguex, near where Albuquerque now stands^m. After exploring the entire pueblo country, they sought the rich kingdom of Quivira^m, penetrating in vain the vast plains area of northwestern Texas, Oklahoma and Kansas.

In 1581 a group of nine soldier-colonists and three missionaries, led by Capt. Francisco Sánchez Chamuscado and Fray Agustín Rodríguez, entered the pueblo country from the Rio Grande Valley, and explored most of the area in which Pueblo Indians^m lived. They were received in peace, and the next spring the soldiers returned to Mexico to tell of their adventures, but the friars did not return and soon suffered martyr-

dom. A small rescue party led by Antonio de Espejo set out in November, 1582, pushed up the Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico, and re-explored the pueblo land. The news brought back by these two expeditions revived old tales of wealth, and the King of Spain ordered that the northern land be added to the empire. Many sought the honor of conquering the region, Juan de Oñate[™] being the winner. In 1598 he proceeded up the Rio Grande Valley to the Chama River. Here he established his capital, San Juan de los Caballeros. A year later it was moved to the near-by San Gabriel. Oñate failed to find the expected wealth, and maintained his authority with difficulty. He resigned in 1607, and in 1609 Pedro de Peralta became governor. Peralta founded a new capital at the Villa de Santa Fé, probably in 1610.

New Mexico now became a great mission field. Celebrated among the missionaries was Fray Alonso de Benavides, whose *Memorials* on New Mexico in 1630 and 1634 give a history of the province. Till 1680 Spanish rule was not seriously challenged, but in that year an Indian rebellion practically cleared the province of Spaniards (see Pueblo Revolt). Diego de Vargas, Marquis of Brazinas, became governor, and (1692-1704) succeeded in re-establishing control. Santa Fé[™] again became the capital, the missionaries came back, Albuquerque was laid out (1706) and other settlements were founded.

Throughout the colonial period the province was exposed to the attack of the Navajo, Ute, Apache and Comanche^{™™}; and after 1700 there were increasing rumors of French invaders. Occasionally French traders came to Santa Fé. In 1776 New Mexico was made part of the Provincias Internas, a commandancy general set up to provide more effective government on the frontier, its capital at Chihuahua.

Spanish rule ended in 1821, as Mexico became independent, and henceforth the province was governed from Mexico City. However, Mexican authority was weak on the frontier, and for the most part New Mexico went its own way until the Americans came. First among them was Zebulon M. Pike[™], in 1806-7. William Becknell, founder of the Santa Fé Trail^{™™}, came in 1821. Year after year, trade with the United States increased. New Mexico easily fell before the invasion of Gen. Kearny[™], who occupied Santa Fé, Aug. 19, 1846 (see Mexican War). It became legally part of the United States by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo[™]. Military rule continued until it became a territory by the Compromise of 1850[™].

Settlement now increased. The gold rush to

California[™] advertised the land, and trappers, cattlemen and miners came to stay. During the Civil War the Confederates under Col. John R. Baylor seized the southern part of the territory. In 1862 Gen. H. H. Sibley (C.) was defeated at Glorieta Pass[™], and the arrival of Gen. James H. Carleton's column from California strengthened the Union forces (see Valverde, Battle of).

Indian raids continued for forty years. In 1863 Kit Carson overwhelmed the Navajoes, but wars with the Apaches did not cease till Gerónimo[™] was captured in 1886.

After repeated attempts, New Mexico succeeded in obtaining statehood in 1912.

[L. B. Bloom and T. C. Donnelly, *New Mexico History and Civics*, G. P. Hammond and T. C. Donnelly, *The Story of New Mexico*; G. P. Hammond, *Don Juan de Oñate and the Founding of New Mexico*, R. E. Twitchell, *Leading Facts of New Mexican History*; *The New Mexico Historical Review* and the *Publications of the Quivira Society* contain much information on New Mexico History]

GEORGE P. HAMMOND

New Nationalism is the term used to describe the political philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt that the nation is the best instrument for advancing progressive democracy. In more detail, it meant emphasis upon the need for political, social and industrial reforms, such as government regulation and control of corporations, better working conditions for labor, conservation of natural resources and more power directly in the people; the ineffectiveness of the states in dealing with these problems, and the consequent necessity of using the powers of the National Government and of increasing those powers to the extent necessary. (See also New Freedom, New Deal.)

[Joseph Bucklin Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time*; Progressive Party Platform, in Kirk H. Porter, *National Party Platforms*.]

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL

New Netherland. No serious attempt was made to plant a colony in New Netherland before the organization of the Dutch West India Company[™] in 1620. In the spring of 1624, however, a group of thirty families, most of whom were Walloons[™], were sent over in the ship *New Netherland*. A few of the emigrants remained at the mouth of the Hudson, but the greater part were settled up the Hudson River at Fort Orange, where the city of Albany[™] now stands. A fort was also built on Nut (Governors[™]) Island and shortly afterward Willem Verhulst received the appointment of *commies* and sailed for New Netherland. Three months after Verhulst's arrival the thinly settled colony was reinforced by the coming of forty-two new emigrants. In ad-

dition one of the directors of the company sent 103 head of livestock, including horses, cows, hogs and sheep. In July, 1625, the settlement was moved from Nut Island to Manhattan^o and called New Amsterdam^o. A new fort was built.

Verhulst did not remain long in New Amsterdam. His own council found him guilty of mismanagement. He was dismissed and Peter Minuit appointed in his place as the first director-general. Minuit negotiated the purchase of Manhattan from the Indians, paying the value of sixty guilders in trinkets, thus legalizing the occupation already in effect. In 1626 because of trouble with the Indians, Minuit moved the families at Fort Orange to Manhattan, leaving only a small garrison behind under Sebastian Crol.

Members of the settlement had no voice in its administration. Power was centered in the hands of the director and his council, who were appointed by and represented the company. The colonists for the most part were not free agents, but were bound by contracts to the company. Although farmers were allotted free land, they were obliged to stay in the colony for six years. The company had right of first purchase of the produce from their fields, and they could sell their farms only to one of the other colonists. Indentured husbandmen, under still more rigid restrictions, worked the company farms. Instructions in considerable detail were sent to the director by the company, and only in cases of urgent necessity was he allowed to modify his orders. New legislation was submitted to the executive committee of the company, as were, also, appeals in judicial cases. Later, important matters often came before the States-General. The Reform Church was supported though freedom of conscience was granted.

The first few years showed a moderate profit to the company from trade, but the efforts at colonization proved a loss. Among the directors of the company two parties appeared, one favoring active colonization of the province, the other desirous of restricting the company to its trading function. The former group was successful in 1629 in the passage of the Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions, which provided for the grant of great estates, called patroonships^o, to such members of the company as should found settlements of fifty persons within four years. The effect of patroonships under the charter has been overemphasized. With the single exception of Rensselaerswyck, they were unsuccessful. Another type of landholding provided for in the charter was destined to be of far greater importance. "Private persons" were allowed to take

possession of as much land as they could properly cultivate. In 1638, further to encourage colonization, trade restrictions in the colony were reduced, better provision was offered for transportation of settlers and their goods and the fur-trade monopoly was discontinued. The revised charter of 1640 reduced the size of future patroonships and held out promises of local self-government.

In 1632 Minuit was recalled, and Wouter Van Twiller named as his successor. The administration of Van Twiller was marked by violent quarrels with his council and prominent colonists. In 1637 his failure to send reports to the company resulted in his recall, and the appointment of Willem Kieft as director-general. An adventurer with a bad record, Kieft did nothing to improve it during his administration. By the summer of 1641 his brutal and unwise Indian policy had created so dangerous a situation that he was constrained to ask the colonists to elect a board to advise with him. The Twelve Men were chosen, and although they had been called only to give advice on Indian affairs, to Kieft's annoyance, they drew up a petition asking for much-needed reforms. The Indian difficulties died down temporarily, but in September, 1643, an unprovoked night attack, instigated by Kieft, on an Indian encampment, caused the tribes to rise in fury. Safety was to be found only in the immediate vicinity of the fort. Distant Fort Orange alone was not molested. Kieft once more called for an election of representatives, and the Eight Men were chosen. In October and again in the following year they petitioned the company for aid, bitterly criticizing Kieft's management of Indian relations. Conditions in the province were desperate. The frightened settlers huddling in or near the fort faced starvation. Hostile bands of Indians, estimated as totaling 15,000, threatened attack. Fortunately, however, the Indians had no common and concerted plan of attack. June brought reinforcements, but hostilities dragged on and it was not until August, 1645, that a general peace was signed. The Indian war had not extended to Fort Orange and the patroon's colony of Rensselaerswyck, although trade suffered. Despite the restrictions imposed by the company, this little settlement had grown by 1645 to a sizable colony.

The complaints of the Eight Men and similar protests from private persons resulted in the recall of Kieft, and on May 11, 1647, Peter Stuyvesant, his successor, arrived in New Amsterdam. The new director was honorable, active and conscientious, but his autocratic disposition and his hostility to popular demands led to continual

friction. Conditions in the province were bad, trade was in a state of confusion, morals low and money urgently needed. In September, 1647, as a means of raising revenue, Stuyvesant called for an election of representatives. The Nine Men were chosen. They met the requests of the director-general fairly, and expressed themselves as willing to tax themselves to help finish the church and to reorganize the school. And then, despite protests from Stuyvesant, they drew up and sent to Holland two documents known as the Petition^o and Remonstrance of New Netherland. The Petition was a concise statement of the unsatisfactory condition of the province, with suggested remedies, and the Remonstrance a longer document, furnishing in detail the facts on which they based their appeal. In April, 1652, the company, inclined to grant some of the concessions asked, instructed Stuyvesant to give New Amsterdam a "burgher government."

Although Stuyvesant made a sincere attempt to maintain friendly relations with the Indians, yet he had to fight three Indian wars. The first broke out in 1655 in New Amsterdam and extended to the Esopus and Long Island settlements. Five years later there was a serious outbreak at Esopus^o, which was aggravated when Stuyvesant sent some of the Indian captives to Curaçao as slaves. This incident rankled, and the Indians rose again, so it was May, 1664, before a general peace was signed.

The gradual encroachment of settlers from New England on territory claimed by the Dutch had been a source of trouble since the beginning of the colony. Rivalry over the fur trade and complaint from the English traders against the tariffs levied at New Amsterdam increased the ill feeling. Stuyvesant took up the quarrel vigorously. No decision was reached over the tariff and Indian trade disputes, but the question of boundaries was finally settled by the Treaty of Hartford in 1650^o. The last year of the Dutch regime in New Netherland was fraught with grave anxiety of Indian wars, rebellion and British invasion. Stuyvesant tried vainly to put the province in a state of defense, but on Aug. 29, 1664, was forced to surrender to an English fleet, which came to claim the province in the name of the Duke of York. (*See also* York's, Duke of, Proprietary.)

[A. C. Flick, ed., *History of the State of New York*, Vols. I and II.]

A. C. FLICK

New Orleans, located 100 miles above the mouth of the Mississippi, where the river approaches nearest to Lake Pontchartrain, was founded by Bienville in 1718 as a strategic trad-

ing post, and became the capital of French Louisiana in 1722. The original town, now called the "vieux carré,"^o developed slowly during the French and Spanish periods, being nearly destroyed by fires in 1788 and 1794. Following the fires, substantial buildings replaced the former flimsy structures, and by 1803 it was a small European type of city with 8000 population.

The rise of steamboats^o on the Western waters and the rapid development of the interior made New Orleans the commercial and financial emporium of the entire Mississippi Valley and the second port of the United States in ante-bellum days, with a population of 160,000 in 1860. The rapid influx of American settlers and traders, Latin-American political refugees, and German, Irish and other European immigrants made ante-bellum New Orleans the most cosmopolitan and most foreign city in the country. There, Latin and American culture and vice flourished side by side, the city becoming noted for its French Opera, American Theater, quad-room balls, cafés, gambling houses, exchanges and its "wide open" character in general.

The blight of Civil War, the penetration of the Mississippi Valley by railroads with accompanying decline in steamboat traffic, and the rise of competing Gulf ports, reduced its relative commercial importance; but New Orleans remains the South's largest and most picturesque city, with nearly 500,000 population, and famed for its Mardi Gras^o festivals and its "vieux carré."

Located behind the Mississippi levees^o, it has been periodically threatened by the river and menaced by heavy rainfall; but the Bonnet Carré spillway, recently constructed at Federal expense, adequately protects it from river inundation, and the world's greatest drainage system quickly disposes of surplus rainfall.

[John S. Kendall, *History of New Orleans*; Henry Rightor, ed., *Standard History of New Orleans*; Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*; Alcée Fortier, *History of Louisiana*; Henry E. Chambers, *History of Louisiana*; Grace King, *New Orleans: The Place and the People*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

New Orleans, Battle of. The United States declared war upon Great Britain in June, 1812 (*see* War of 1812), but the contest did not threaten Louisiana until near its close. After Napoleon's abdication early in 1814, England was free to concentrate her energies upon the American war. A veteran army was despatched to attack the South and West, the home of the "War Hawks,"^o leading proponents of the war. In the autumn of 1814 a British fleet of over fifty vessels, carrying 7500 soldiers under Sir Edward Packenham, appeared in the Gulf of Mex-

ico preparatory to attacking New Orleans, the key to the entire Mississippi Valley. The defenses of the city had been neglected, since the war up to that time had been waged mainly on the Canadian border. Under threat of British attack, Gov. Claiborne undertook such defensive measures as he could with the limited means at his command. Gen. Andrew Jackson, who commanded the American army in the Southwest, reached New Orleans on Dec. 1, 1814, and immediately began preparations for defense.

Instead of coming up the Mississippi River as was expected, the superior British navy defeated the small American fleet on Lake Borgne⁹⁹, landing their troops on its border and marching them across the swamps to the banks of the Mississippi, a few miles below New Orleans. Jackson had succeeded in assembling a force of between 6000 and 7000 troops, mainly Kentucky, Tennessee and Louisiana militia, with a few regulars. After a few preliminary skirmishes late in December, 1814 (*see Villere's Plantation, Battle at*), the British withheld their attack until their full strength could be brought to bear. The decisive battle, lasting less than a half-hour, was fought on the morning of Jan. 8, 1815, when the British undertook to carry the American position by storm (*see Chalmette Plantation*). So effective was the American defense that the British were completely repulsed, losing over 2000 men, of whom 289 were killed, including Gen. Packenham and most of the other higher officers. Due to the protection of their breastworks, the Americans lost only 71, of whom 13 were killed.

The British soon retired to their ships and departed. New Orleans and the Mississippi Valley were saved from invasion. Coming two weeks after the treaty of peace (*see Ghent, Treaty of*), the battle had no effect upon the peace terms; but it did have a tremendous effect upon the political fortunes of Andrew Jackson, the "Hero of New Orleans"

[John Smith Kendall, *History of New Orleans*; Henry Rightor, ed., *Standard History of New Orleans*; Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*; Alcée Fortier, *History of Louisiana*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

New Orleans, Capture of (1862). At the outbreak of the Civil War the Federal authorities recognized the strategic importance of seizing New Orleans, the commercial emporium of the entire Mississippi Valley and the second port of the United States. Because of pressing needs elsewhere and overestimation of the strength of their defenses, the Confederates had failed to render the approaches to New Orleans impregnable. In the spring of 1862 a naval squadron under Ad-

miral David G. Farragut, carrying an army commanded by Gen. Benjamin F. Butler, entered the lower Mississippi. The chief defenses against approach by river to New Orleans were forts Jackson and St. Philip⁹⁹, about sixty miles below the city, between which had been stretched a heavy chain cable, supported upon rafts, with a secondary defense beyond it, consisting of a group of fire-rafts loaded with pine knots and some armored rams⁹⁹. After firing upon the forts for some days, Farragut succeeded in cutting the chain and passing the forts in the night, without any very serious damage to his fleet, and shortly thereafter he appeared before New Orleans. Gen. Mansfield Lovell had only 3000 Confederate troops to protect the city, and, realizing that resistance was useless, he withdrew to the northward, leaving the city to fall into the hands of the Federal forces on May 1, 1862.

[John Smith Kendall, *History of New Orleans*; Alcée Fortier, *History of Louisiana*; C. A. Evans, ed., *Confederate Military History*, Vol. X; James Ford Rhodes, *History of the Civil War, 1861-1865*; James Kendall Hosmer, *The Appeal to Arms, 1861-1863*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

New Orleans, Martial Law in (1806-7). Reports of the mysterious advance of Burr⁹⁹ and his men down the Mississippi during the fall of 1806 caused Gov. Claiborne much anxiety at New Orleans. Uneasiness was increased by rumors that Gen. Wilkinson and a detachment of troops were on the way to defend the city. Arriving in New Orleans late in November, 1806, Wilkinson, with Claiborne's hesitant support, imposed martial law, forbade the movement of shipping, repaired fortifications and arrested those suspected of being agents or friends of Burr. Those held appealed to local courts for release, but Wilkinson refused to yield to civil authority and even sent several east as military prisoners (*see Bollman Case*). The panic-stricken city began to throw off this virtual reign of terror as news of Burr's arrest arrived. It was not, however, until Wilkinson left for Richmond (May 20, 1807) to testify at the Burr trial, that the city returned to health and sanity.

[W. F. McCaleb, *The Aaron Burr Conspiracy*.]

ELIZABETH WARREN

New Orleans, THE, first steamboat on Western waters, was built at Pittsburgh by Nicholas Roosevelt under Fulton-Livingston patents during 1810-11 (*see Fulton's Folly*). This side-wheeler of between 300 and 400 tons left Pittsburgh on Oct. 20, 1811, braved the Falls of the Ohio⁹⁹ and the New Madrid earthquake, and reached New Orleans, Jan. 10, 1812. She never

returned to Pittsburgh, plying in the New Orleans-Natchez trade until snagged on July 14, 1814.

[W. J. Petersen, *Steamboating on the Upper Mississippi*.]

WILLIAM J. PETERSEN

New Orleans Riots, THE (1873-74), resulted from the rivalries of two Reconstruction^{er} political factions, headed, respectively, by W. P. Kellogg (Rep.), the *de facto* governor, and John McEnery (Dem.), who claimed the office as governor *de jure*. The disorders began March 5, 1873, when some of McEnery's partisans attacked two police stations occupied by the Metropolitan Police. They were repulsed with a loss of two killed and several wounded. On March 6 the members of McEnery's legislature were arrested, and not released until they had spent some hours in a local jail. Clashes between citizens and Republican officials also occurred elsewhere in Louisiana, and were checked by the intervention of United States troops. Protests against this use of the army, made by the McEneryites to President Grant, were disregarded. This led to the organization of the White League^{er} (April-June, 1874), which was responsible for the uprising against Kellogg in New Orleans on Sept. 14, 1874. In the fighting the Metropolitan Police were defeated with a loss of eleven killed and sixty wounded. The League suffered a loss of sixteen killed and forty-five wounded. McEnery took over the state government the following day, but United States troops were hurried into the city, and on Sept. 17 Kellogg was restored without opposition. The uprising was devoid of immediate results, but is regarded as paving the way for the overthrow of the Republican regime in Louisiana three years later (*see* Home Rule, Restoration of, in the South).

[Albert Phelps, *Louisiana*; Ella Lonn, *Reconstruction in Louisiana*.]

JOHN S. KENDALL

New Plymouth, The Colony of, was founded by a group of about 100 English emigrants who came over in the *Mayflower* in 1620. The dominant element in this group consisted of religious dissenters who had separated from the Anglican Church because of their dissatisfaction with its doctrines and practices. Some of these Separatists^{er} had come from Leyden in the Netherlands, where they had been living for more than a decade since leaving their original homes in northern England to escape persecution and the religious contamination incident to association with their Anglican neighbors. After a brief sojourn in Amsterdam, they settled in Leyden, where they organized a flourishing church. Al-

though they enjoyed religious freedom, they became dissatisfied in their new home. They were unwilling to give up the language and customs of England for those of Holland, had difficulty in making a comfortable living in a foreign land, and were disturbed over the enticements to worldliness and immorality to which their children were subjected. Accordingly, some of them (thirty-five in number) decided to join others of their coreligionists in England and go to the New World. Both groups sailed on the *Mayflower*^{er} from Plymouth, England, Sept. 16, 1620. On Dec. 26, after five weeks spent in exploring Cape Cod, the *Mayflower* anchored in the harbor of what came to be Plymouth, Mass. The task of erecting suitable houses was rendered difficult by the lateness of the season, although the winter was a comparatively mild one. Nearly all of the Indians in the vicinity had been destroyed by pestilence and the few survivors gave no trouble. On the contrary, their deserted cornfields afforded the settlers quite an advantage. Partly owing to poor housing facilities, and largely because of the run-down condition of the emigrants as a result of a lack of proper food on the voyage, there was great suffering the first winter and nearly half of their number died. By spring there had come a turn for the better, and in a few years the menace of a food shortage was permanently removed.

The capital for the undertaking was furnished by a group of London merchants. An agreement was entered into between these "adventurers"^{er} and the settlers whereby a sort of joint-stock company was formed. The arrangement proved unsatisfactory to both the adventurers and the planters, and in 1627 the former sold their interests to the latter and thus withdrew from the venture. From this time on the planters were the sole stockholders of the corporation which had become a colony.

During the first decade Plymouth was the only settlement, but gradually other villages were established and so the town of Plymouth widened into the colony of New Plymouth.

Before embarking for America the Pilgrims^{er} had received assurances from James I that they would not be molested in the practice of their religion. A patent was also received from the Virginia Company^{er} authorizing them to settle on its grant and enjoy the right of self-government. But as they had landed outside the limits of the Virginia Company this patent was of no avail. The settlers, therefore, had no title to their lands and no legal authority to establish a government. It was not long, however, before a valid title to the land was obtained in the form

of patents issued (in 1621 and 1630) by the Council for New England²⁰. But the power to form a government was not conferred by these patents. The Pilgrims had, however, before landing organized themselves into a body politic by entering into a solemn covenant that they would make just and equal laws and would yield obedience to the same. This agreement, known as the Mayflower Compact²¹, was signed by all the adult male settlers except eight, who were probably ill at the time. On the basis of this covenant a liberal government was founded for the colony. Laws were made by the General Court²², which was at first a primary and later a representative assembly of one house, the members of which were chosen annually by popular election. Administrative and certain important judicial functions were performed by the governor and the assistants, who were elected each year by the "freemen," or qualified voters. On the death of the first governor, John Carver (April, 1621), William Bradford was chosen as his successor. He was continued in office by re-election for more than thirty years.

New Plymouth was not well adapted to agriculture, as there was a scarcity of cultivable land in the colony. Nor was the location of the settlement as favorable for a profitable business in fishing and fur trading as were those of the other Puritan colonies. Consequently, the Pilgrims did not play a leading role in the history of colonial New England although it was largely due to their initiative that the Congregational²³ form of church government was adopted in that section. New Plymouth was quite overshadowed by its neighbors, Connecticut and Massachusetts Bay, and was finally (1691) absorbed by the latter.

[R. G. Usher, *The Pilgrims and Their History*; W. T. Davis, ed., *Bradford's History of Plymouth Plantation*.]

O. P. CHITWOOD

New Smyrna Colony, THE. During 1767 and 1768 Dr. Andrew Turnbull brought some 1400 persons from Greece, Italy and the island of Minorca to Florida, to cultivate sugar cane, rice, indigo, cotton and other crops on a grant of 60,000 acres of land adjacent to Mosquito Inlet that in 1767 had been made to Turnbull, Sir William Duncan and Sir Richard Temple (the latter acting as trustee for Sir George Grenville). Colonists were to work for from seven to eight years and at the end of the period receive tracts of fifty or more acres of land, according to the size of the family. The settlement, named New Smyrna for Smyrna, birthplace of Turnbull's wife, lasted until 1776, when the colonists

marched in a body to St. Augustine to ask for relief from their indentures on account of alleged cruel treatment. Only 600 by this time remained and these settled in St. Augustine after they had been released by the governor.

[George R. Fairbanks, *Florida: Its History and Its Romance*; Carita Doggett, *Dr. Andrew Turnbull and the New Smyrna Colony*.]

W. T. CASH

New South, THE, is a general and somewhat indefinite phrase signifying the social and economic changes and developments since Reconstruction²⁴. While the phrase had been used before, universal acceptance followed the famous oration of Henry W. Grady, editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, delivered before the New England Society of New York, in December, 1886. Mr. Grady made no apologies for the past, and declared that the contest had been war and not rebellion, but went on to declare that the South had accepted the outcome, and had turned its face toward the future, instead of brooding over the past; that hope and confidence were taking the place of passivity or despair.

These statements were generally taken to mean that the South was to become assimilated to the cultural and economic pattern of the North, though Mr. Grady hardly meant this. To some extent this assimilation has taken place, particularly in industry. Manufactures of many kinds have sprung up. The section now leads in cotton textiles, fertilizers and tobacco, and the production of rayon and knitted goods is increasing rapidly. It is important in furniture and also in iron and steel. It leads in oil production, but the control of that industry is in the hands of great combinations in the North. The urban population has greatly increased, and many busy towns or cities resemble in outward appearance similar communities in other sections. The amount of money spent for education, both primary and secondary, has increased enormously, and thousands of miles of excellent roads have been built.

Though the Old South has apparently almost disappeared, the New South, speaking broadly, is still distinct in psychology and general attitude. Politically, the people have not divided (*see Solid South*), and while relations with the Negro are steadily improving the whites are still unwilling to accept race equality. Religiously they are still conservative. The section still feels that the difficulty of its problems is not understood by the nation.

[Holland Thompson, *The New South*.]

HOLLAND THOMPSON

New Style. *See* Calendar, The.

New Sweden, The Colony of. In March, 1638, two ships, *Kalmar Nyckel* and *Fogel Grip*, brought to the Delaware River twenty-three Swedish soldiers and two officers to establish the first and only Swedish colony in the New World. They built a fort on the shore of a small river emptying into the Delaware, which stream they named Christina (after their queen) Kill. The site of this first permanent settlement in the entire Delaware River Valley, including Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, is now within the boundaries of the city of Wilmington, Del. Having bought from the Indians a tract of land on the western side of the Delaware extending from Sankikan (Trenton, N. J.) to Cape Henlopen at the mouth of Delaware Bay, they claimed this territory for their country, calling it New Sweden.

In 1640 a second expedition arrived with supplies and new colonists, their first governor, Peter Hollandaer, and the first clergyman, Rev. Reorus Torkillus. Another expedition arrived in 1641 and a fourth in 1643, bringing a new governor, Johan Printz.

Printz started at once to extend his domain, building small forts on the eastern or New Jersey side of the Delaware, at Tinicum, near the present site of Philadelphia, at Upland (Chester, Pa.) and at the mouth of the Schuylkill River. More ships came and more colonists, the forests were cleared, farms cultivated, a village, Christinahamn, was laid out behind Fort Christina^{ss}, their first establishment.

Johan Printz ruled New Sweden with despotic power. Military leader, as well as civil governor, lawgiver, chief judge and head of all the colony's activities, he was supreme over the whole Delaware Valley south of Sankikan. He was "a man of brave size, weighing over 400 pounds," headstrong, tyrannical, rough, violent, overbearing, arrogant and arbitrary, but an intelligent man, a brave soldier, a strict disciplinarian, an able administrator. In all, he was a colonial governor whose character and achievements have been unjustly slighted. He monopolized the fur trade, driving out English who came from New Haven and Dutch who came from New Amsterdam^{ss} seeking to establish trading posts and settlements. By successive expeditions the colony increased to nearly 400 people.

Pieter Stuyvesant, Dutch governor of New Amsterdam, built a fort at Sandhook (New Castle^{ss}, Del.) called Casimir. Printz's successor, Johan Rising, in 1653, captured it and again gave Sweden the control of the whole valley. This so angered the Dutch in Holland that in 1655 they sent a warship to New Amsterdam,

where it was joined by six others. With 300 fighting men Stuyvesant came down from Manhattan, took his fort back again and, after a ten days' bloodless siege, captured also Fort Christina. Thus New Sweden disappeared from the map and a Dutch province took its place.

[Christopher Ward, *The Dutch and Swedes on the Delaware*.]

CHRISTOPHER WARD

New Sweden Company, THE. Although several Swedish trading companies were formed during the second quarter of the 17th century, the organization that founded the first Swedish overseas colony was the New Sweden Company. Established in 1637, for the purpose of trading and planting colonies on the coast of North America from Newfoundland to Florida, this company secured its first foothold on American soil in the present State of Delaware in the year 1638 (*see* New Sweden, The Colony of).

The principal promoters of the company were Axel Oxenstierna, regent and chancellor of Sweden, Samuel Blommaert of Holland, a director of the Dutch West India Company, Peter Minuit, formerly director of the colony of New Netherland at New Amsterdam, Admiral Klas Fleming of the Swedish navy and Peter Spiring, diplomatic representative of Sweden in Holland.

The cost of the first expedition, 36,000 florins, was subscribed to equally by Swedes and Hollanders, all the above-named persons, except Minuit, being among the subscribers. Minuit was chosen director of the expedition. In 1642 the company was reorganized and became entirely Swedish.

[Amandus Johnson, *The Swedish Settlements on the Delaware*.]

GEORGE H. RYDEN

New Thought Movement is the name given to the liberal wing of the mental healers. They look upon P. P. Quimby as the pioneer whose ideas have been handed down to them through the Dressers. The name was first used by the Church of the Higher Life which was formed in Boston (1894), among whose members were some of Quimby's disciples. The first New Thought convention was held in San Francisco the same year, and in successive years New Thought groups began to appear in various parts of the United States. In 1915 an International New Thought Alliance was formed, which adopted a constitution and set forth a series of affirmations, laying stress upon health, happiness and success. New Thought groups do not profess to be churches; in fact, they ask no one to give up his church membership. Rather it is their design to make men and women efficient in whatever relation of

life they may find themselves. The Society of Silent Unity in Kansas City is an example of a New Thought organization, with its health restaurants and its attractive propaganda publications.

[Horatio W. Dresser, *A History of the New Thought Movement*.]
WILLIAM W. SWEET

New Ulm, Defense of (1862). Citizens of New Ulm, Minn., German town on the Minnesota River, warned by refugees of the Sioux uprising⁷, hastily barricaded the business section and repulsed a sharp Sioux raid on the afternoon of Aug. 19. Reinforced by volunteer companies led by Judge C. E. Flandrau of St. Peter, who took general command, some 250 guns faced the main Sioux attack on Aug. 23. In a desperate all-day battle against heavy odds, the defenders, after losses of twenty-six killed, beat off the Indians. Some minor skirmishing on the 24th marked the final Sioux retreat.

[W. W. Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*, Vol. II.]
WILLOUGHBY M. BABCOCK

"New West," THE, is a term used by F. J. Turner and his school of historians to describe the states to the west of the Allegheny Mountains, including Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi and Louisiana, which settled up rapidly after 1815 and became "a dominant force in American life."

[F. J. Turner, *Rise of the New West*.]

JOHN D. HICKS

New York, Capture of (1673). During the summer of 1673 rumors of the approach of a Dutch squadron with a design of recapturing the city reached New York. Gov. Lovelace failed to take them seriously, however, and in July made a long-deferred visit to Gov. Winthrop of Connecticut, leaving Capt. Manning in charge at Fort James. On July 28 a fleet of twenty-three ships, under the joint command of Cornelius Evertsen, Jr., and Jacob Binckes, appeared off Sandy Hook. Manning, putting up as brave a front as possible, demanded of the Dutch why they came "in such a hostile manner," and hurriedly dispatched an express to Lovelace, in New Haven, begging him to return at once. The Dutch commanders replied they had come to take that which "was their own." Manning tried frantically to raise volunteers. On July 30 the fleet came within musket shot of the fort. Manning parleyed for delay until morning. He was given a respite of half an hour. When the time expired the Dutch fleet opened fire. The fort held out for four hours and then surrendered.

[A. C. Flick, ed., *History of the State of New York*, Vol. II.]

A. C. FLICK

New York, Colony of (1689-1776). The year 1689 was a time of anxiety, violence and unrest in the colony of New York (*see* York's, Duke of, Proprietary). A declaration of war against France had followed the accession of William and Mary to the throne of England. A revolt in New England caused the arrest of Gov. Andros (*see* New England, Dominion of). His representative in New York, Capt. Francis Nicholson, fled and Capt. Jacob Leisler⁷ seized control of the government. Albany attempted to resist Leisler's authority, but the burning of Schenectady⁷ by the French and Indians in 1690 forced the magistrates to yield. The government of William III, too weak to attempt anything in America, had left the colonies to their own resources. In the spring of 1690, with the co-operation of Massachusetts, Leisler called a meeting of the northern colonies in New York City. An attack on Montreal was planned. The expedition was a failure, and Leisler with a tactlessness which spoiled all of his efforts attempted to throw the blame on Fitz-John Winthrop of Connecticut, who had been in command. The following spring, upon the arrival of Col. Sloughter, who had been commissioned governor of the province by William and Mary, Leisler and his chief associates were tried for treason and Leisler and Milbourne executed. Leisler and anti-Leisler factions continued, however, to disturb the colony for many years.

Fletcher, who succeeded Sloughter in 1692, interested himself energetically in the problems of defense and Indian relations. Acting on the advice of Peter Schuyler of Albany, he conciliated the Five Nations⁷, and bound them to a renewed alliance with England. This alliance, which had become a cardinal point of British policy in New York, was further strengthened during the administration of Bellomont by the action of the Iroquois in conveying to the care of the king of England the western lands which they claimed by conquest (*see* Iroquois Beaver Land Deed). Bellomont was shocked by his predecessor's generosity in granting enormous tracts of land to favored individuals, and managed to have some of these grants set aside. An able man, and a friend of the small landowner, his administration was cut short by his death in 1701 (*see* New York, Land Speculation in).

Lord Cornbury, who arrived in 1701, renewed the policy of making extravagant grants. His arrogance and corruption greatly antagonized the assembly, which had been slowly growing in power and importance, and hastened the contest over the power of the purse, which was to agitate the province throughout the remainder of

the colonial period. A short respite was granted the colony between the peace of Ryswick⁹⁷ in 1697 and the second (Queen Anne's⁹⁸) war with the French. Although New York furnished her quota of men and money requested by the home government, the influence of the Albany traders tended to keep the colony neutral, when not specifically asked to take action. This tendency to neutrality and the trade between Albany and Montreal was the occasion of bitter complaint from the New England colonies.

Gov. Robert Hunter, whose administration (1710-19) witnessed the close of the war, was one of the ablest of the royal governors. By skillful management he compromised with the assembly and was able to bring a reasonable amount of stability and peace to the colony. One of the major problems of his administration was that of the Palatine⁹⁹ refugees, who had been brought over to make naval stores¹⁰⁰. This unfortunate enterprise strained Hunter's personal credit in caring for the refugees. Gov. Burnet inherited the Palatine problem, which was finally solved by the settlement of most of them on the Mohawk frontier to form a barrier against French attack.

The arrival of William Cosby as governor in 1732 witnessed the beginning of a period of violent popular agitation. Smarting under the accusations of maladministration printed in Peter Zenger's small newspaper, the *New York Weekly Journal*, Cosby ordered Zenger's¹⁰¹ arrest. In the trial that followed the principle that truth is the justification for making a public statement was established.

The French continued their encroachments on territory claimed by New York. In 1727 a fort was built by the British at Oswego to offset the rival French post at Niagara¹⁰². In 1731 the French occupied Crown Point¹⁰³. Hostilities broke out again in 1744. George Clinton, then governor of New York, was a man of courage and ability, but possessed little tact. His furious feud with James DeLancey, chief justice of the province, caused a bitter fight over the conduct of the war and the appropriation of funds by the assembly. As a result, the only effective action taken by the colony was through the exertions on the western frontier of Sir William Johnson, who was able to exercise sufficient influence over the Six Nations to keep their friendship (*see* Indian Policy, Colonial).

In 1754 DeLancey was acting head of the provincial government. He presided over the famous Albany Congress¹⁰⁴, and in the fourth and final war with the French which followed (*see* French and Indian War), he gave firm support to the king's commanders. In 1759 Amherst compelled

the French to abandon Ticonderoga¹⁰⁵ and Crown Point, and Johnson, assisted by 900 Indians, captured Niagara. Throughout the war until the reduction of Montreal¹⁰⁶ by Amherst in 1760 the western frontier of New York suffered cruelly.

The conviction had been growing in America that taxation should originate only in the colonial assemblies¹⁰⁷. The passage of the Stamp Act¹⁰⁸ in 1765 aroused a storm of opposition. In October delegates from nine colonies met in New York to protest, and the following spring the act was repealed. In 1767, however, the Townshend Acts¹⁰⁹, putting a duty on paint, paper and tea, were passed. In protest the merchants of New York signed a nonimportation¹¹⁰ agreement, boycotting British goods. To add to the discontent in New York the currency bill of 1769 was disallowed (*see* Royal Disallowance). The Sons of Liberty¹¹¹ again became active, and in 1770 the disturbances came to a climax in the battle of Golden Hill¹¹². The duties on glass, paint and paper were repealed and the agitation died down until the fall of 1773. In January, 1774, a committee of correspondence¹¹³ was appointed to write to "our sister colonies." In April of that year a group of "Mohawks" threw eighteen cases of tea into the harbor. Local and state revolutionary committees took over the government of the colony. On July 9, 1776, the Provincial Congress of New York approved the Declaration of Independence¹¹⁴, and on the following day declared that New York had begun its existence as a free state (*see* New York, State of).

[A. C. Flick, ed., *History of the State of New York*, Vols. II and III.]

A. C. FLICK

New York, Land Speculation in, was early encouraged by the Dutch practice of granting large tracts of land to individuals or associated groups for the promotion of settlement. This practice was continued and extended by the early English governors. Speculation became a fever, which did not abate until the outbreak of the Revolution. From 1690 to 1775 the majority of the prominent men of the colony were involved, either singly or in joint partnerships, in some sort of land speculation. Lord Bellomont succeeded in having some of the extravagant grants made by Fletcher, whom he followed as governor, voided. But his activities were cut short by his death, and under Lord Cornbury the patenting of great tracts was resumed. The home government, awakened to some extent to the danger, attempted to set up safeguards. Starting with Lovelace and Hunter, the number of acres to be granted to a single individual was limited. Evasion, however, was common. The governors had come to regard the fees

paid for granting patents as a part of their legitimate income. The practice grew up of granting land to a number of associates, often not the real owners. Careless surveys resulted in overlapping claims and litigation. Immigration and settlement were retarded, the settlers preferring the small freeholds offered by other colonies to the landlord-tenant relationship or higher prices in New York.

Although some of the estates and large holdings of Tory^o landowners were broken up, the newly created state government did little, at the conclusion of hostilities in the Revolution, to protect or encourage the small landowner. As by treaties with the Indians, or otherwise, new sections were opened to settlement, speculators rushed in and bought up great tracts to sell to prospective settlers. Disputes over boundaries with neighboring states caused conflicting titles and claims to ownership of land. Both the royal governors of New York and New Hampshire had issued grants in the present State of Vermont (see "Green Mountain Boys"), and the bitterness and confusion which resulted did not end until Vermont^o was admitted into the Union as an independent state in 1791. In 1786 the claim of Massachusetts to a vast tract east of the present western boundary of New York was settled by giving to Massachusetts the right of first purchase from the Indians and to New York the right of sovereignty to the disputed territory. In 1788 this vast tract was sold by Massachusetts to Phelps^o and Gorham. One third of the territory was, however, all that the Indians could be persuaded to part with at that time. The greater portion of this tract was sold to Robert Morris in 1790, and resold by him to Sir William Pulteney, John Hornby and Patrick Colquhoun, who became known as the London Associates (see Pulteney Purchase). The remaining two thirds, upon being relinquished by Phelps and Gorham because of financial difficulties, was also bought by Morris, who subsequently resold the greater part to a group of Dutch bankers, known as the Holland Land Company^o. The long-term contracts of sale, by which title did not pass until the final payment, were later to be the cause of considerable disturbance in the six western counties of New York (see Anti-Rent Agitation).

The difficulty of getting an immediate cash return from many of the actual settlers, and the competition of the hundreds of millions of acres available in New England, the Middle States, the South and the West, much of it obtainable on the easiest terms and under the most favorable political conditions, caused the speculators in New York to turn their eyes abroad, where

large cash sales could be made more easily. Tracts of land were hawked from one European capital to another. In 1786 with a desire to promote settlement on the unpatented land recently purchased from the Indians, the legislature of the state prepared to have the lands surveyed and offered for sale. Unfortunately, no effort was made to see that sales were made to actual settlers, and most of the territory fell into the hands of speculators, some of it eventually to reach the European market. The land south of Great Tract IV and north of the Black River was sold to Peter Chassanis, of Paris, and subsequently, the plan to settle French colonists there having failed, one half of it was sold to Gouverneur Morris, and the other half to James LeRoy deChaumont (see Castorland Company).

[R. L. Higgins, *Expansion in New York.*]

A. C. FLICK

New York, State of. Following the recommendation of the Continental Congress^o on May 10, 1776, the Provincial Congress on May 27 declared New York's right to self-government and henceforth assumed that the royal provincial rule had come to an end (see New York, Colony of). Finality to this new status was expressed in New York's adoption of the Declaration of Independence^o on July 9. A convention proceeded to frame a new state constitution which was accepted by the legislature on April 20, 1777. The election of George Clinton as the first state governor was announced on July 9 and the new legislative bodies met two months later. Meanwhile, the continuation of the colonial courts and local government was authorized. On Feb. 6, 1778, New York joined the Confederation^o of the United States and, to perfect the new "league of friendship," ceded its western lands^o to Congress. A decade later the state ratified the national Constitution^o by a narrow margin after a bitter struggle, and thus became an integral part of the republic.

Among the serious problems confronting New York were boundaries. By the Treaty of Hartford in 1786 New York's sovereignty over 19,000 square miles in the western part of the state was acknowledged by Massachusetts which retained a pre-emptive right to the land (see Phelps-Gorham Purchase). The old dispute over Vermont (see "Green Mountain Boys") was settled in 1790 when New York recognized Vermont's independence in return for a payment of \$30,000. The remaining boundaries were also amicably adjusted. The feudal land system in the older counties, which gave rise to antirent riots, was not adjusted until the adoption of the Constitu-

tion of 1846 (*see* Anti-Rent Agitation). A tract of 1,500,000 acres in central New York was set aside as the Military Tract^o for Revolutionary soldiers. The wild lands of northern and western New York, bought by land speculators, were quickly settled by immigrants from the older communities (*see* Castorland Company; Macomb Purchase). These settlements developed a network of roads and turnpikes, erected schools and churches, and spread agriculture and local industries. The steamboat^o appeared in 1807; and three years later the population had grown to 961,888.

Because of its location, New York bore the brunt of the War of 1812^o. Although the war was not popular, yet Gov. Daniel D. Tompkins gave it unwavering support, and more than 77,000 New Yorkers served in it. Following the war came the building of the Erie Canal^o and its laterals which, by increasing travel, trade and marketing, stimulated industry and enlarged the wealth of the commonwealth. The \$7,000,000 spent to build the canal system was quickly repaid in tolls and by 1835 the volume of traffic necessitated the enlargement of both channel and locks. The New York Barge Canal^o in 1918 followed as a logical development. Supplementing the Erie Canal came the railroads^o in 1831 and later, which soon formed a network over the state and reduced the cost of transportation still further. By 1833 New York had \$17,500,000 invested in its railroads. Until 1821 Massachusetts was ahead in exports; then New York took the lead and kept it. By the middle of the 19th century New York had won the position of the Empire State in wealth and population. The automobile, cement roads, airplane, power and light, new methods in communication and other discoveries have continued New York's supremacy while greatly modifying its mode of life and work.

Politically, the pattern of government created in 1777 has endured for more than a century and a half, but certain significant changes have been made. The Councils of Appointment and Revision^o were abolished in 1821; the franchise^o was widened to include all adult males in 1846, and all adult females in 1917.

[A. C. Flick, ed., *The History of the State of New York.*]

A. C. FLICK

New York, Treaty of (Aug. 7, 1790). *See* McGillivray Incident.

New York and Genesee Company (1787). Dr. Caleb Benton, Jared Coffin, John Livingston and several wealthy residents of the Hudson

River district formed a company for the purpose of obtaining possession of the Indian country in New York State by leaseholding, ignoring the pre-emption rights of the State of Massachusetts. Livingston obtained the signatures of the Iroquois^o delegates, on a 999-year lease, for all of the Iroquois lands in the state, at a rental fee of \$2000 per year plus a promised bonus of \$20,000. The Indians denied the legality of the lease as it was not signed by the principal chiefs and later legislative action nullified the agreement.

[Robert W. Bingham, *The Cradle of the Queen City.*]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

New York Barge Canal. Long-continued demand for the enlargement of the Erie Canal^o resulted, during the administration of Gov. Benjamin B. Odell, Jr. (1901-4), in the authorization to spend \$101,000,000 for the construction of the Barge Canal. Work was begun in 1905 and the canal was opened in 1918. The present Barge Canal system provides an efficient river canalization suitable for large self-propelled boats or fleets towed by powerful tugs, and includes the old Oswego Canal, the Cayuga and Seneca Canal, the Champlain Canal and the Erie Canal.

[N. E. Whitford, *History of the Barge Canal.*]

A. C. FLICK

New York Central Railroad. The Erie Canal^o, completed in 1825, stimulated the growth of New York, Albany, Troy, Schenectady, Utica, Rochester and Buffalo. With the development of the railroad, various projects were started to connect these and other cities. The first completed was the Mohawk and Hudson^o which, in 1831, joined Albany and Schenectady. Utica was reached in 1836 and Buffalo in 1842. At first there was little co-operation between the roads. At some places there was no physical connection of the roads. At others, although there was a physical connection, the passenger had to change cars. In 1843 through service was established between Albany and Buffalo. The distance was made in twenty-four hours. By an act of April 2, 1853, the small roads were allowed to consolidate to form the New York Central Railroad Company.

Commodore Cornelius Vanderbilt, who had made a fortune in steamships in the 1860's, turned his attention to railroads. In 1863 he became president of the New York and Harlem (started 1832, reached Chatham in 1852), in 1865 of the Hudson River Railroad (started 1847, reached Albany 1851) and in 1867 of the New York Central. The three roads were combined in

1869 to become the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad. In the early 1870's the problem of reaching Chicago was solved in two ways. An interest was obtained in the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern[™] going from Buffalo to Chicago by way of Erie, Cleveland and Toledo. The other route used is the Michigan Central[™] which goes through Canada to Detroit and then to Chicago. An arrangement with the Big Four gave connections from Cleveland to Columbus, Cincinnati, Indianapolis and St. Louis. In 1885 the New York Central took over the West Shore Railroad which had been built parallel to it. Pittsburgh was entered over the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie. The Boston and Albany had been used for many years as a connection, but it was not until 1900 that it was definitely controlled by a lease.

In 1914 a consolidation called the New York Central combined the New York Central and Hudson River and the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern and a number of smaller roads. In 1930 the Michigan Central and Big Four were added by lease making the system one of over 11,000 miles.

In competition with the other trunk lines the New York Central has the advantage of the lowest grades from New York to Chicago.

[S. Daggett, *Principles of Inland Transportation.*]

JAMES D. MAGEE

New York City. The city of New Amsterdam[™] was surrendered by Gov. Peter Stuyvesant in 1664 to a squadron of English vessels under Capt. Richard Nicolls, who became the colonial governor, and served for four years. He changed the name to New York, honoring the Duke of York (later James II), brother of the reigning British monarch, Charles II. The city continued until the Revolution as the seat of government of New York colony[™]. Francis Lovelace, the second governor, called the merchants of the town to meet once a week under the bridge across the Heere Graft, which was essentially the beginning of a merchants exchange. That spot, at the crossing of Broad Street and Exchange Place, continued to be a meeting place for 250 years thereafter, the Curb Market finally developing in the street, where it functioned until it decided to erect its building and went under a roof in 1921. In 1670 Gov. Lovelace bought from the Indians Staten Island[™], destined, two centuries later, to become a borough of the city. In 1673 he inaugurated the first mail service (monthly) to Boston. On Aug. 9, 1673, during Lovelace's absence, a Dutch squadron entered the harbor, and the county sheriff surrendered the city to

its commander. Anthony Colve was the Dutch governor until Feb. 19, 1674, when news came of the ending of the war between Holland and Great Britain, and the colony was returned to British rule.

In 1689 occurred the Leisler rebellion[™]. During Leisler's rule, Peter Delanoy, the first mayor elected by popular vote of the freemen, served from Oct. 14, 1689, until March 20, 1691. The next popular election of a mayor did not take place until 1834. The streets were first lighted and a night watch established in 1697. The first great epidemic of yellow fever[™] occurred in 1702. William Bradford, who had set up a printing press in 1693, published the first newspaper, the *New York Gazette*, on Oct. 16, 1725. The first stage line to Philadelphia was established in 1730, and the first coach to Boston left the present Chatham Square, June 24, 1772. A fire department was organized in 1731, and in that same year Harlem[™], though at several miles' distance, was declared annexed to the city. New York became revolutionary in spirit as early as any part of America. With the passage of the Stamp Act in 1765, the Sons of Liberty[™] were organized, and there was rioting in that year and the next. New York had its "tea party" in 1773, as did Boston, though a less spectacular one than the latter. At the beginning of the Revolution, the city, including the Bowery[™] suburb, scarcely extended as much as a mile and a half up Manhattan Island from the Battery, or about one tenth of the full length of the island. Washington occupied it with a portion of his army in April, 1776, but his defeat in the battle of Long Island[™] on Aug. 27 forced him to evacuate it, and it remained in the hands of the British until the close of the war. Some patriotic citizens fled from the city, many were imprisoned (*see* Sugar House Prisons). On Nov. 23, 1776, a great fire swept through the heart of the city, destroying 500 buildings, or about one third of it. The British asserted that the fire was accidental, but America imputed it to their vandalism, and was greatly incensed by it. On Nov. 25, 1783, the city was formally evacuated by the British, and Washington led the American army down the Bowery Lane and Pearl Street to the waterfront amid scenes of tumultuous rejoicing. He said farewell to his officers at a dinner at Fraunces Tavern[™] (still standing), originally built as the town residence of Etienne DeLancey, a prominent Huguenot immigrant. Until well into the 19th century, Evacuation Day was as important a holiday in New York City as the Fourth of July.

The city was the capital of New York State from 1784 until 1797, when the seat of govern-

ment was removed to Albany. In 1785 it became the capital of the confederated nation, and in 1789 of the new republic. Washington was sworn in as first President on the balcony of Federal Hall, and took up his residence at No. 1 Cherry Street, whose site is now occupied by one of the great towers of the Brooklyn Bridge. The first national Congress met in the city that year, but in the following year, the capital was removed to Philadelphia.

The first national census, taken in 1790, showed New York's population to be 33,131. Its growth in the next few decades was amazing. In 1800 it was 60,515; in 1810, 96,373, in 1820, 123,706; in 1830, 202,589; in 1840, 312,710, an increase of 110,000; in 1850, 515,547, an increase of over 200,000; in 1860, 813,669, an increase of nearly 300,000! In seventy years it had multiplied twenty-four and a half times! Soon after 1800 it began leaving Boston and Philadelphia behind, both in population and as the nation's most important seaport. Immigration⁹⁹, mostly from the British Isles and Germany, played no small part in this rapid growth. The immigrants, many of them physically and mentally unfit, were coming far too rapidly to be assimilated, and before 1800 a slum district began to appear in what is now known as the lower East Side, where it still existed in the second quarter of the 20th century.

Serious fires occurred in 1778, 1796 and 1804, and on Dec. 16-17, 1835, the greatest conflagration in the city's history raged on the east side of the main business district, destroying 600 buildings, with a loss of \$20,000,000. In 1845 another fire in somewhat the same locality swept away 300 buildings and 30 human lives, and caused a loss of \$10,000,000.

The mayors were chosen by the board of aldermen or the common council until 1834, when they began to be elected by popular vote. In 1808 engineers plotted the city streets as far north as 155th Street, and made the mistake of establishing the streets running east and west only 200 feet apart, while the avenues running north and south are often from 800 to 875 feet apart, a process exactly the reverse of what it should be, and the principal cause of the great traffic problems of the 20th century. The city was blockaded by a British fleet in 1813. Two small stone blockhouses, erected during this war, still survive in Central and in Morningside parks.

The city's first public water supply, pumped from wells and delivered to users through wooden pipes, was undertaken in 1799 by the Manhattan Company, organized by Aaron Burr. The

city's great project by which water was brought from the Croton River, about thirty miles distant, through a large aqueduct, was opened in 1842. The Crystal Palace Exhibition of 1853, Tammany Hall's rise to power in the city government, the Draft Riots and the Tweed Ring scandals are treated in separate articles⁹⁹. The population passed the million mark before 1880 and by 1890 it was 1,441,216. In 1874 more than twenty square miles of territory north of the Harlem River, comprising the most of what is now the borough of the Bronx, was annexed. By the Legislative Act of 1896, what was known as "Greater New York" came into existence on Jan. 1, 1898. This included the existing City of New York (which was coextensive with New York County), Kings County (Brooklyn⁹⁹), Richmond County (all of Staten Island), practically all of Queens County and parts of Hempstead, East Chester and Pelham. Under the new charter, adopted in 1899, this territory of 359 square miles was divided into the boroughs of Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens and Richmond. The borough of the Bronx was given a county government of its own in 1914. The greater city had in 1900 a population of 3,437,202. Robert A. Van Wyck was the first mayor of the new corporation.

Until the opening of the Brooklyn Bridge⁹⁹ in 1883, the original New York (Manhattan) could be reached from New Jersey, Brooklyn and other parts of Long Island and Staten Island only by ferries. The creation of the greater city began to bring new connections rapidly. Two new bridges, the Williamsburg (1903) and Queensborough (1909), were opened across the East River and other bridges and tunnels followed shortly (*see* Bridges; Subways; Tunnels). In 1921 the Port of New York Authority was created, which within a few years built the George Washington Bridge, the first to span the Hudson at or near New York (completed 1931), the Holland Tunnel and the Triboro Bridge.

New York has from very early days been the seat of a number of institutions of higher learning. Some of the largest are Columbia University⁹⁹, founded in 1754; New York University (1831); Fordham University (1841); College of the City of New York (1848); Manhattan College (1853); Hunter College (1870); and Barnard College (1889).

[William Thompson Bonner, *New York, the World's Metropolis*.]
ALVIN F. HARLOW

New York City, Plot to Burn (November, 1864). As an aftermath of the Niagara Falls Conference and the raid on St. Albans⁹⁹ an attempt

was made to burn New York City. Originally planned for Nov. 8, the attempt was postponed to the 25th. Barnum's Museum^o, the Astor House and a number of other hotels and theaters were fired with phosphorus and turpentine, but the damage was trifling

[J. F. Rhodes, *History of the United States*, Vol. V.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

New York Clearinghouse was established by the banks of New York City in 1853 to facilitate the handling of checks of other banks received by each bank. It was the first clearinghouse in the United States. It cleared each business day, and settlement was made the same day. In addition to the saving involved in clearing, it gave the banks a chance for unified action. In 1861 it united the banks to take \$150,000,000 of United States government bonds. In 1860 and many times after, Clearinghouse Loan Certificates were issued to aid weak banks in times of crises. In 1899 a system of uniform charges for collection of out-of-town checks was introduced, using a zoning plan. At the outbreak of the World War it helped the formation of the \$100,000,000 gold exchange fund to take care of United States obligations coming due in Europe.

[R. L. Garis, *Principles of Money, Credit and Banking*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

New York Gets the News (April 23, 1775). About noon on Sunday, April 23, 1775, Israel Bissell, an express rider, arrived in New York City with the news of the battle of Lexington^o. The city was thrown into a state of great excitement. The arsenal was broken open and about 600 muskets with ammunition were seized and distributed among "the most active of the citizens," who formed a "voluntary corps and assumed the government of the city." They took possession of the customhouse and the public stores. They paraded the streets. All business ceased. The posts were stopped and letters read. Acting Gov. Cadwallader Colden wrote that a "state of anarchy and confusion" prevailed. Summoning the council the following day, he was told that the militia were all Liberty Boys^o and would not aid the government. Assurance was given, however, that all was quiet in Dutchess and Queens counties. On May 1, 1775, a Committee of One Hundred was chosen to act "in the present alarming emergency" and assumed control of the city. The militia was ordered to patrol the streets. It was forbidden to remove provisions from the city. Dr. Myles Cooper, president of King's College, and other pronounced loyalists^o were forced to flee. The British troops

stationed in the city were embarked on the warship *Asia* to prevent a clash with the excited people.

[A. C. Flick, *The American Revolution in New York*.]

A. C. FLICK

New York under the Duke of York. See York's, Duke of, Proprietary.

New York World's Fair, THE (1939), was the first international exposition that New York had offered to the world since 1853 (see Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations). It was scheduled to run six months from April 30, 1939, the 150th anniversary of George Washington's inauguration as first President of the United States under the Federal Constitution. In addition to this commemoration of American democracy the Fair dedicated itself to the "Building of the World of Tomorrow," by exhibiting, in a logical and coherent manner, the best tools, ideas, industrial techniques and social services available to the average man and woman of the day. Built on 1216½ acres in Flushing Meadow Park, designed to become one of the great metropolitan recreation centers, the Fair cost more than \$155,000,000. At the close of the 1939 exposition only a small fraction of the bond issue of \$27,829,500 had been retired. Of the total of 32,786,521 admissions 25,817,265 were paid. The Fair secured the official participation of sixty foreign nations together with twenty-three American states and one territory. By the end of 1939 plans had been drawn for the continuation of a smaller exposition, built upon a different theme, for 1940.

[Frank Monaghan, *Official Guide Book of the New York World's Fair*, various editions 1939; and *The Fairs of Yesterday: The Fair of Tomorrow*, 1937.]

FRANK MONAGHAN

Newark, N. J. Chagrin at the absorption of their colony (New Haven^o) by Connecticut, moved citizens of Branford, Guilford and Milford to seek homes elsewhere. With the publication in New England of the Concessions and Agreement^o their attention was drawn to New Jersey^o. Led by Robert Treat they selected a site recommended by Gov. Carteret on the Passaic River and, in May, 1666, some thirty settlers arrived. Their town, which they named Newark, after the English home of their pastor, Abraham Pierson, held Indian deeds to most of the present Essex County, N. J. At first, only members of some Congregational^o church could become citizens, but soon nonchurch members were admitted and Presbyterian^o forms replaced "the Congregational way." Newark's industrial foundations were laid with the establishment of a tannery

(1698), and by 1790 an export market for shoes had developed. The first newspapers, both weeklies, were Wood's *Newark Gazette and New Jersey Advertiser* (1791) and the *Centinel of Freedom* (1796). The town was the seat of the College of New Jersey (Princeton University^m) from 1747 to 1756. It was made a port of entry (1834) and incorporated as a city (1836).

[Joseph Atkinson, *History of Newark, New Jersey*.]

C. A. TITUS

Newberry v. United States (256 U. S. 232, 1921). Truman H. Newberry, in his Senate race against Henry Ford in the Michigan Republican primary of 1920, spent over \$100,000, thereby violating a Federal law of 1910, as amended in 1911. He claimed that he had not spent the money himself, and had not known that it was being spent. The Supreme Court decided that a primary was not an essential part of an election, as that term was understood by the framers of the Constitution, whereupon the Senate voted that Newberry was entitled to his seat. These decisions proved so unpopular, and Newberry, because of them, such a liability to his party, that he was induced to resign his seat. This series of incidents resulted in the passage of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

[Spencer Ervin, *Henry Ford vs. Truman H. Newberry: A Study in American Politics, Legislation and Justice*; Charles E. Merriam and Louise Overacker, *Primary Elections*; James K. Pollock, *Party Campaign Funds, and Money and Politics Abroad*; Earl R. Sikes, *State and Federal Corrupt Practice Legislation*.]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Newborn, THE (or *Neugeborene*, or *Stille im Lande*, or Baumanites), was a short-lived sect, started by Matthias Bauman, a Palatinate German, after coming to Oley, Montgomery County, Pa., in 1719. He preached a doctrine of regeneration by heavenly vision making sin impossible, rejected church sacraments and much of the Bible, and discouraged matrimony.

[Julius Friedrich Sachse, *The German Sectarians of Pennsylvania, 1708-1742*.]

ASA E. MARTIN

Newburgh Addresses, THE (March, 1783). Revolutionary officers, long unpaid, suspected, after Yorktown^m, the inability or disinclination of Congress to settle their claims before demobilization^m. Respectful memorials begging relief availed nothing. At Newburgh (N. Y.) winter quarters, exasperated officers were anonymously summoned to meet on March 11, to consider measures redressing grievances. An eloquent, unsigned address was circulated, urging direct action—an appeal from “the justice to the fears of government.” Coercion of Congress was point-

edly suggested. Washington, who was present in camp, with characteristic firmness intervened, denounced the “irregular invitation” and called a representative meeting for the 15th. A second anonymous address from the same pen then appeared, less vehement in tone. The Commander in Chief met a delegation and advised patience and confidence in the good faith of Congress. His enormous influence calmed the agitation, resolutions approving his counsel and reprobating the addresses being adopted. Maj. John Armstrong, Jr., a brilliant young soldier on Gen. Gates' staff, afterward general, minister to France and Secretary of War, was the writer of the two papers. Washington later expressed belief that his motives were patriotic, if misguided. Armstrong, writing in the *United States Magazine* (1823), admitted his authorship.

[John Marshall, *Life of Washington*; B. J. Lossing, *Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution*; complete text of both addresses is in *Journals of Congress*, Vol. XXIV, 295 ff.]

CHARLES WINSLOW ELLIOTT

Newlands Reclamation Act (1902). *See* Reclamation; Irrigation.

Newlands Reclamation Project, THE, operated by the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District, is located in Churchill and Lyon counties, Nev. Lahontan Dam and the Derby Canal, diverting water from the Truckee to the Carson River, are the chief engineering features. Water-right contract over irrigable lands reached its maximum about the close of the World War but the area of harvested crops has steadily increased. Alfalfa is the major crop, with wheat and barley for feeding as second. Cantaloupe growing has declined but turkeys are an important industry. Dairying is the major livestock industry.

[F. B. Headley, *Production of Crops and Livestock on the Newlands Project, 1912-1936*, *Univ. of Nev. Agric. Experiment Station Bulletin*, No. 146.]

JEANNE ELIZABETH WIER

Newport, R. I., was founded in May, 1639, by William Coddington, John Clarke and others, who had previously been at Portsmouth, on the north end of the island. In Newport was established the second Baptist church in America. From the beginning, the city subscribed to the same principle of religious freedom that animated the Roger Williams settlement at Providence^m. Consequently it became a haven for the persecuted; the first Quakers arrived in 1657, and the Jews in 1658^m.

Newport was an important colonial seaport; shipbuilding^m began very early, Long Wharf was

a busy mart by 1685, and by the mid-18th century the city was at the height of its commercial glory. Rhode Island's first permanent newspaper, the *Newport Mercury*, was established here in 1758 by James Franklin, Jr.

During the Revolution the city was held by the British, 1776-79, after which it became the headquarters for America's French allies under Gen. Rochambeau (see Newport, The French Army at) Newport lost many influential residents through the war, as rich Loyalists^o, like the Wantons and the Brentons, fled the country, while many patriot families moved to the interior of the state.

[R. M. Bayles, *History of Newport County, Rhode Island.*]

JARVIS M. MORSE

Newport, The French Army at (1780). The French fleet of forty-four vessels under Admiral de Ternay, bringing a force of 6000 French soldiers under the command of the Count de Rochambeau, arrived off Newport on July 10, 1780. The landing of the troops began the next day and Newport was illuminated in honor of the occasion. The presence of the French officers added to the gaiety of the social life. A printing press issued a newspaper in French. Some 600 or 800 of Lauzun's cavalry were sent to Connecticut for the winter and a part of the infantry was sent to Providence. On June 10, 1781, the French army left Newport by boat for Providence and thence marched to Yorktown^o where it participated in the siege which resulted in the surrender of Cornwallis and the end of the war.

[Edwin M. Stone, *Our French Allies.*]

HOWARD M. CHAPIN

Newport Barracks, Ky., on the Licking River, opposite Cincinnati^o, was established about 1805 as an arsenal, and was later used also as a recruit depot. Troops returned here at the end of the Mexican War; during the Civil War a small garrison was retained, after which Newport Barracks again became a recruit depot. It was menaced during Bragg's Kentucky invasion^o. Later the post was moved several miles inland and renamed Fort Thomas.

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

News Reporting, American, dating broadly from *Publick Occurrences*^o in 1690, and relatively free after the Zenger case^o of 1735, suffered the handicaps of an impoverished, shallow or blatantly partisan press through most of its first century and a half. The Revolution was poorly reported, but considerable news of the first Congresses appeared in struggling sheets and by the early 1800's party papers were reporting speeches in detail.

Modern reporting originated with the first penny paper (1833), Day's New York *Sun*, which addressed itself to the common man and promoted sensationalism to the point of outright faking. Competition for "scoops" began with Bennett's New York *Herald* (1835), which stressed popular news writing, extended Wall Street coverage, and used the first steamships for transmitting foreign intelligence (1838). Denouncing "the degrading police reports" of its contemporaries, Greeley's New York *Tribune* (1841) raised standards with careful reporting of new ideas, often by distinguished writers. By 1860 roving editors and correspondents had made Washington a regular "beat," had written up the West and South, and had described Europe in leisurely newsletters.

Experimental war reporting, begun in the Mexican War, flowered during the Civil War. Sharing the soldier's hardships and eluding censors, a net of newsgatherers made the newspaper a national institution. Circulations skyrocketed as "extras" became commonplace, and news surpassed editorials in interest. Dana's *Sun* (1868) exalted artistic, narrative writing, while Godkin's New York *Evening Post* (1881) combined literary grace with Tammany^o exposures, and Pulitzer's New York *World* (1883) reported its crusades for the working classes. Hearst's greater sensationalism provoked the "yellow journalism"^o battle of the 1890's and news column exploitation of the trouble with Spain in 1898.

After 1900 the expansion of advertising, which enlarged newspapers and increased their prosperity, resulted in a vast extension of newsgathering, Sunday sections, sports reporting and syndicated features. World War reporting, hindered by censorship, emphasized news pictures and ushered in tabloids^o. After the 1929 crash, news writers were called on to describe and interpret complex problems in economics, finance, government and social and international relationships. Experts, comparable to academic social scientists, developed on some staffs, notably that of the New York *Times*, which by wide coverage approximated a national newspaper.

From the application of steam to presses (1822) and the coming of the telegraph (1844), invention joined social and economic changes in shaping news reporting. The steamboat, railroad, cable, typewriter, telephone, wireless, motor truck and airplane, the rotary press, stereotyping process, linotype, engraving process and wire-photo all speeded news assembly and distribution. Telegraphic transmission also produced cooperative wire newsgathering (1846) and the Associated Press^o with its influence for standardi-

zation and impartiality. The Hearst and Scripps chains and their wire services were further forces toward uniformity.

A century after the cheap daily's arrival, consolidations had made news presentation a virtual monopoly in many cities. American reporting became definitely a business enterprise, and was freer, fairer and infinitely more informative than anywhere else in the world.

[W. G. Bleyer, *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism*, J. M. Lee, *History of American Journalism*; Frederic Hudson, *Journalism in the United States*; A. M. Lee, *The Daily Newspaper in America*; Victor Rosewater, *History of Co-operative News-Gathering*, O. G. Villard, *The Press Today*; F. L. Bullard, *Famous War Correspondents*; Laurence Greene, *America Goes to Press*]

IRVING DILLIARD

Newspaper Editors and Editing. The first American newspaper editor was Benjamin Harris, who, on Sept. 25, 1690, issued in Boston a paper called *Publick Occurrences Both Foreign and Domestick*, which was promptly suppressed. The first editor to sustain a journal was John Campbell, who conducted the *Boston News-Letter* for eighteen years beginning April 24, 1704. American newspaper editing may be said to have passed through four main phases. At the outset the editor combined newspaper publication with book printing, job printing, general retailing, and often (as with John Campbell) employment as postmaster, he was of necessity a jack-of-many-trades. With the growth of political parties just before the Revolution he became primarily a political employee. The editor during and after the war commonly attached himself to some political figure or coterie. Philip Freneau and the *National Gazette* were encouraged by Jefferson, Noah Webster and the *American Minerva* by Jay and by Rufus King, William Coleman and the *Evening Post* by Hamilton. The editor was now a political writer, whose pen was employed on vitriolic articles and pamphlets. But as population thickened, society became more democratic and national interests broadened, the basis was laid for a press independent of party. James Gordon Bennett's *New York Herald*, launched May 6, 1835, had no patron but the public, avowed its independence of party, and depended for success upon pungent editorials and fresh, comprehensive news. A period of great independent editors, who ruled politicians rather than were ruled by them, followed. The principal figures before the Civil War were William Cullen Bryant, James Gordon Bennett, Horace Greeley, Samuel Bowles and Henry J. Raymond; after the war, Whitelaw Reid, Charles A. Dana, E. L. Godkin, Henry Watterson, Joseph Medill and Joseph Pulitzer. In dealing with the news

the methods of these editors varied widely; Pulitzer, like Bennett before him and William Randolph Hearst after him, was sensational (see *Yellow Journalism*), while Godkin and Whitelaw Reid were quiet and conservative. But all hold their place in journalism primarily for the vigor, color and power of their editorial pages. The period of these editorial giants practically ended with the 19th century, when Adolph S. Ochs and others were bringing in the newspaper that was primarily a commercial enterprise. This emphasized news over opinion, avoided editorial leadership, was moderate if not neutral on most issues and aimed chiefly at business success.

[Willard G. Bleyer, *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism*, James Melvin Lee, *History of American Journalism*; Frederic Hudson, *Journalism in the United States*.]

ALLAN NEVINS

Newspaper Syndicates. Distribution to other newspapers of the President's message printed by the *New York Sun* in December, 1841, introduced the syndicate idea; but regular service did not begin until 1861. Unable to get enough type set after his journeyman had gone to war, A. N. Kellogg of the Baraboo (Wisconsin) *Republican* had the "insides" of his paper printed in the office of the *Wisconsin State Journal*. This worked so well that in 1865 he organized the first "syndicate" to supply ready-printed "insides" for country weeklies. Soon many papers were being furnished miscellany, advertisements, and even news, printed on one side of their sheets by a syndicate. In 1875 this service was supplemented by stereotyped blocks, or "boilerplate" (later in the form of paper matrices), shipped to publishers for use on their own presses.

Metropolitan papers as early as 1870 began to use syndicated matter, especially in their Sunday supplements. Stories by such distinguished authors as Kipling and Conan Doyle were distributed by a syndicate organized by Irving Bachelor in 1884, and colored comics, exploited by Pulitzer and Hearst, opened a new field. Consolidation of competing syndicates after 1890 was attended by innovations in services, and improvement in features. A collateral development was the co-operative news syndicate.

[E. S. Watson, *A History of Newspaper Syndicates in the United States*; A. M. Lee, *The Daily Newspaper in America*.]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Newspapers. In the period immediately following the close of the Revolutionary War, the newspaper press of the United States found innumerable opportunities for expansion. The extent of this expansion is indicated by the fact

that where about 100 newspaper enterprises had been undertaken in seventy years under the colonial governments (*see* Colonial Newspaper, The) before the Revolution and about fifty more had made a beginning during the course of the war, some 500 new newspapers were started within the original thirteen states in the seventeen years between the treaty of peace and the end of the century. And in the first two decades of the new century about 700 more newspapers were started within the same area. Altogether, in less than forty years of independence, we find some 1200 such enterprises, to contrast with the 150 newspapers established during eighty years before independence.

But the expansion of the American newspaper press was by no means confined to the area of the thirteen original states. The Definitive Treaty of Peace in 1783 made available for settlement the vast "Western Country" between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River, and the resultant waves of westward migration opened up wholly new fields for newspaper enterprise. The new settlements in the West had their distinctive problems and aspirations, and it became the function of their newspapers to give expression to the life of the frontier²⁷ and to assist in molding the institutions of pioneer communities.

The first newspaper west of the mountains was the *Pittsburgh Gazette*²⁸, established July 29, 1786, by John Scull and Joseph Hall, two young printers from Philadelphia. The moving spirit of this enterprise was Hugh Henry Brackenridge, a lawyer and former Revolutionary officer, who had visited the site of Pittsburgh and visualized its possibilities. A newspaper, he believed, was essential to the development of the recently plotted town, and it was at his instigation that Scull and Hall moved westward with their printing equipment.

A patriotic resident of Kentucky, John Bradford, a surveyor by profession with no previous knowledge of the printing craft, brought the press into his community as a measure of public service. Representatives of the "District of Kentucky" were in convention for the purpose of effecting separation from Virginia and attaining independent statehood (*see* Western Separatism). There was need of a newspaper to publish the deliberations of the convention to the widely scattered citizens of Kentucky. No Eastern printer would accept the invitation to venture so far into the wilderness, so Bradford undertook the task. He sent to Pittsburgh for press and type and founded the *Kentucke Gazette* at Lexington, on Aug. 11, 1787.

As new areas were settled and territorial gov-

ernments were set up, the means of printing the laws and other official documents, with newspapers for the information of the public, were primary essentials. It was to meet such demands that George Roulstone and Robert Ferguson left North Carolina to establish the *Knoxville Gazette* at Hawkins Courthouse, now Rogersville, Tenn., on Nov. 5, 1791, nearly a year before Knoxville, the intended site of their operations as public printers for Tennessee, had even been laid out. Similarly, William Maxwell, after a brief career as a printer in Kentucky, moved across the Ohio to establish the *Centinel of the North-Western Territory*²⁹ at Cincinnati on Nov. 9, 1793. In 1804 Elihu Stout, who had been trained as a printer in Kentucky, moved to Vincennes and there became public printer for Indiana Territory, and established the *Indiana Gazette* on July 31. On July 12, 1808, Joseph Charless, who had been a printer in Philadelphia and later for some years in Kentucky, founded the *Missouri Gazette* at St. Louis, while that region was still a part of Louisiana Territory. And Matthew Duncan, another printer from Kentucky, answered the call of the governor of Illinois Territory and set up his press at Kaskaskia³⁰, where he began the *Illinois Herald* in May, 1814.

Meanwhile, an attempt had been made to publish a newspaper at Detroit in 1809—the *Michigan Essay*, of which only one issue is known to have been printed. The newspaper press of Michigan did not make a successful beginning until July 25, 1817, when John P. Sheldon and Ebenezer Reed, both printers from the State of New York, founded the *Detroit Gazette*.

In a widely different part of the "Western Country," the pioneer newspaper in the Mississippi Territory was the *Mississippi Gazette*, established, according to all available evidence, by Benjamin M. Stokes at Natchez late in 1799 or early in 1800. The history of the newspaper press in Alabama dates from May 23, 1811, when Samuel Miller and John B. Hood began the *Mobile Centinel* at Fort Stoddert, being unable at the time to enter Mobile itself.

All in all, the "Western Country," including Missouri, gave birth to about 250 newspapers before 1821. The mortality rate of these enterprises, however, was exceedingly high. Few survived more than a few years, and many perished within a few months or even weeks. But each represented a great amount of pioneering effort in the face of innumerable difficulties, and each testifies to the laudable intentions, at least, of its founder to serve the needs of a frontier community while struggling to make an often inadequate living for himself and his family.

Until after the Civil War the typical American newspaper, especially outside of the larger cities, was printed on one sheet folded to make four pages. As long as they had to be printed on flat-bed platen presses, their dimensions were limited to the size of the sheet that such presses could accommodate, and pages of about 12 by 18 inches were the rule. The contents of those little papers were meager. There was little if any strictly local news. Letters from correspondents in other places and from local subscribers, extracts from other newspapers received in exchange and especially their foreign news, occasionally some legislative acts or local ordinances, legal notices, a bit of commercial news, with short poems, anecdotes or literary extracts as "fillers"—this was the typical reading matter. A presidential or a gubernatorial message might give occasion for the printing of an additional half-sheet or an "extra." There was but little editorial comment at first, but by 1820 the press was becoming markedly partisan and free expression of editorial opinion was the rule. By 1830 the introduction of the cylinder press with steam power made larger sheets possible, and there was an increase in the amount and variety of reading matter. Also there was more opportunity for editorial expression, and the newspapers gave themselves wholeheartedly to political, religious and even personal controversy, often of the bitterest and most vindictive nature.

Advertising²⁷ in the early newspapers was inconspicuous. There was no attempt at display, and advertisements as a rule would run for months with no change in copy. If other matter pressed for space, advertisements were simply dropped to make way for it. Although advertising was a source of revenue, it seems to have been rather incidental in the earlier years of our newspapers.

The limitations of the hand-operated flat-bed presses, together with relatively high costs of paper, kept circulations within a few hundred copies except in the large centers, where a thousand or so was a notably large circulation until the means of production had improved. Income from subscriptions and advertising was often insufficient to maintain the printer, who also did job printing, printed and sold books, kept a book store or sold general merchandise. Distribution of newspapers was a problem, and innumerable early publishers were also postmasters. There was keen rivalry for the public printing as an important and dependable source of revenue.

The cities demanded more frequent news service, and even in colonial days there were semi-weeklies. Some of these became triweeklies, and

just at the close of the Revolution a need was felt for a daily in Philadelphia. Benjamin Towne, in May, 1783, began publishing there the *Pennsylvania Evening Post and Daily Advertiser*. This was followed in September, 1784, by the *Pennsylvania Packet and Daily Advertiser* of John Dunlap and David C. Claypoole. Also in 1784 a daily was begun in Charleston, S. C., and in February and March, 1785, two dailies were started in New York City within a few days of each other, including the *Daily Advertiser* by Francis Childs, the first daily newspaper to start as such without a previous history as a weekly, semiweekly, or triweekly. In 1790 there were eight daily newspapers in the country; in 1820 there were forty-two.

The first Sunday newspaper was the *Baltimore Weekly Museum* in 1797. It ran for only a few weeks. Somewhat more successful was the *New York Observer*, which started in 1809 and continued for about two years. These papers were both weeklies, of eight pages in magazine format. Sunday papers were severely condemned and did not become at all common until after the Civil War.

Also bitterly denounced by the more conservative press were the first "penny" papers. The *New York Sun* was the first to succeed with a one-cent newspaper in 1833. It competed with old-established papers which sold for six cents and it featured news that appealed to the common people but which the older papers ignored as beneath their notice. With the cheap newspaper also appeared the newsboy, to hawk the papers on the streets.

Improved means of production rapidly changed newspaper history. The first steam-power press in the United States appeared in 1822, but power-driven presses were not in common use until the 1830's. The first cylinder press was imported into the country in 1824; it made possible the use of a much larger sheet of paper than had previously been possible, as well as a much greater speed of production. A rotary press, with the type ingeniously fitted to its cylinder, made its appearance in 1846. Stereotyping had come into use in the 1830's, but it was not until 1861 that curved stereotypes could successfully be fitted to the cylinders of the rotary presses. Paper was always cut into sheets for feeding into the press sheet by sheet until 1863, when paper began to be delivered to the pressroom in rolls. Roll-fed rotary presses were in use by 1871, folders were added to the presses in 1876. Rotary presses were next assembled in gangs, each press producing its own part of a many-paged newspaper, all the parts being assembled and folded at the delivery point.

Another revolutionary development was the appearance of wood-pulp paper about 1870, to take the place of the expensive rag papers. The general use of newsprint made from wood pulp effected a startling reduction in the cost of production of a newspaper (see Paper and Pulp).

Telegraphic news first found its way into the news columns about 1844. Syndicated matter sold to newspapers all over the country in stereotyped form known as "boilerplate" appeared in the 1870's (see Newspaper Syndicates). The new process of photoengraving made its debut in newspapers in March, 1873, when the New York *Daily Graphic* printed the first line engraving produced by that process. In 1880 the same newspaper printed the first halftone made direct from a photograph.

In spite of numerous attempts to perfect a mechanism for setting type, all type was set by hand until July, 1886, when the New York *Tribune* made the first practical use of Ottmar Mergenthaler's linotype^m. With later improvements, the linotype entirely superseded the hand composition of single types for body matter of newspapers, and invention of the monotype and Ludlow greatly facilitated the setting of display heads and advertising.

Among the latest developments in the newspaper field are the use of the rotogravure process for pictorial supplements, the wide adoption of comic sections^m printed in color and the printing of color for advertising or editorial features on the regular news pages of weekday issues.

But with the rapid development in recent years of mechanical facilities for newspaper production, the capital investment in a modern newspaper plant has enormously increased.

There follows a list of the first newspapers established in each state and the District of Columbia, with the dates of their establishment, and the names of their printers or publishers:

ALABAMA

1811: May 23. Fort Stoddert: *Mobile Centinel*. Samuel Miller and John B. Hood

ARIZONA

1859: March 3. Tubac: *Weekly Arizonian*. William Wrightson, publisher; Edward E. Cross, editor; Jack Sims and George Smithson, printers

ARKANSAS

1819: Nov. 20. Arkansas Post: *Arkansas Gazette*. William Edward Woodruff

CALIFORNIA

1846: Aug. 15. Monterey: *Californian*. Walter Colton and Robert Semple

Newspapers

COLORADO

1859: April 23. Denver ("Cherry Creek"): *Rocky Mountain News*. William Newton Byers

CONNECTICUT

1755: April 12. New Haven: *Connecticut Gazette*. James Parker

DELAWARE

1762: Wilmington: *Wilmington Courant*. James Adams. (This newspaper is known from tradition only and was perhaps never published.)

1785: June. Wilmington: *Delaware Gazette*. Jacob A. Killen

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1789: Feb. 12. Georgetown: *Times, and Patowmack Packet*. Charles Fierer

FLORIDA

1783: April ? Saint Augustine: *East Florida Gazette*. John and William Charles Wells

GEORGIA

1763: April 7. Savannah: *Georgia Gazette*. James Johnston

IDAHO

1862: Aug. ? Lewiston: *Golden Age*. Alexander S. Gould

ILLINOIS

1814: May. Kaskaskia: *Illinois Herald*. Matthew Duncan

INDIANA

1804: July 31. Vincennes: *Indiana Gazette*. Elihu Stout

IOWA

1836: May 11. Dubuque: *Du Buque Visitor*. John King, editor; William Cary Jones, printer

KANSAS

1835: March 1. Shawnee Baptist Mission: *Siwinowe Kesibwi* (The Shawnee Sun). Johnston Lykins, editor, Jotham Meeker, printer (a semimonthly newspaper in the Shawnee Indian language)

1854: Sept. 15. Leavenworth: *Kansas Weekly Herald*. William H. Adams

KENTUCKY

1787: Aug. 11. Lexington: *Kentucke Gazette*. John and Fielding Bradford

LOUISIANA

1794: March ? New Orleans: *Moniteur de la Louisiane*. Louis Duclot

MAINE

1785: Jan. 1. Falmouth (Portland): *Falmouth Gazette*. Benjamin Titcomb and Thomas Baker Wait

MARYLAND

1727: Sept. Annapolis: *Maryland Gazette*. William Parks

MASSACHUSETTS

1690: Sept. 25. Boston: *Publick Occurrences* (one issue only). Benjamin Harris, publisher; Richard Pierce, printer
 1704: April 24. Boston: *Boston News-Letter*. John Campbell, publisher; Bartholomew Green, printer

MICHIGAN

1809: Aug. 31. Detroit: *Michigan Essay* (one issue only). James M. Miller
 1817: July 25. Detroit: *Detroit Gazette*. John P. Sheldon and Ebenezer Reed

MINNESOTA

1849: April 28. Saint Paul: *Minnesota Pioneer*. James M. Goodhue

MISSISSIPPI

1799 or 1800: Natchez: *Mississippi Gazette*. Benjamin M. Stokes
 (The actual date of establishment has not yet been definitely determined; it was late in 1799 or early in 1800.)

MISSOURI

1808: July 12. Saint Louis: *Missouri Gazette*. Joseph Charless

MONTANA

1864: Aug. 27. Virginia City: *Montana Post*. John Buchanan, editor and proprietor; Marion M. Manner, printer. (Preceded, probably as early as 1863, by several issues of newsletters printed at Bannack and Virginia City.)

NEBRASKA

1854: Nov. 15. Bellevue: *Nebraska Palladium*. Thomas Morton, publisher; D. E. Reed & Co., editors and proprietors

NEVADA

1858: Dec. 18. Genoa: *Territorial Enterprise*. William L. Jernegan and Alfred James

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1756: Oct. 7. Portsmouth: *New-Hampshire Gazette*. Daniel Fowle

NEW JERSEY

1765: Sept. 21. Woodbridge: *Constitutional Courant* (one issue only). "Andrew Marvel," pseudonym for William Goddard
 1776: Sept. 21. Newark: *New-York Gazette* (previously published in New York City). Hugh Gaine
 1777: Dec. 5. Burlington: *New-Jersey Gazette*. Isaac Collins

NEW MEXICO

1834: Santa Fé: *El Crepúsculo de la Libertad* (The Dawn of Liberty). Antonio Barreiro, editor and publisher; press of Ramon Abreú; Jesús María Baca, printer
 1847: Sept. 10. Santa Fé: *Santa Fe Republican*. Oliver P. Hovey and E. T. Davies

NEW YORK

1725: Nov. 8. New York: *New-York Gazette*. William Bradford

NORTH CAROLINA

1751: July ? New Bern: *North-Carolina Gazette*. James Davis

NORTH DAKOTA

1864: July 7. Fort Union: *Frontier Scout*. Company I, 30th Wisconsin Volunteers, proprietors; S. C. Winegar and Goodwin, publishers

OHIO

1793: Nov. 9. Cincinnati: *Centinel of the North-Western Territory*. William Maxwell

OKLAHOMA

1844. Sept. 26. Talequah: *Cherokee Advocate* (in Cherokee and English). William Potter Ross, editor

OREGON

1846. Feb. 5. Oregon City: *Spectator*. Oregon Printing Association; William G. T'Vault, editor, John Fleming, printer

PENNSYLVANIA

1719: Dec. 22. Philadelphia: *American Weekly Mercury*. Andrew Bradford and John Copson

RHODE ISLAND

1732: Sept. 27. Newport: *Rhode-Island Gazette*. James Franklin

SOUTH CAROLINA

1732: Jan. 8. Charleston: *South-Carolina Gazette*. Thomas Whitmarsh

SOUTH DAKOTA

1858: June ? Sioux Falls: *Dakotah Democrat*. Samuel J. Albright

TENNESSEE

1791: Nov. 5. Rogersville: *Knoxville Gazette*. George Roulstone and Robert Ferguson

TEXAS

1819: Aug. 14. Nacogdoches: *Texas Republican*. Horatio Bigelow, editor; Eli Harris, printer

UTAH

1850: June 15. Salt Lake City. *Deseret News*. Willard Richards, editor and publisher; Horace K. Whitney and Brigham H. Young, printers

VERMONT

1780: Dec. 14. Westminster: *Vermont Gazette and Green Mountain Post-Boy*. Judah Padock Spooner and Timothy Green IV

VIRGINIA

1736: Aug. 6. Williamsburg: *Virginia Gazette*. William Parks

WASHINGTON

1852: Sept. 11. Olympia: *Columbian*. James W. Wiley and Thornton F. McElroy

WEST VIRGINIA

1790: Nov. 15? Shepherdstown: *Potomac Guardian*. Nathaniel Willis

WISCONSIN

1833: Dec. 11. Navarino (Green Bay): *Green-Bay Intelligencer*. Albert G. Ellis and John V. Suydam.

WYOMING

1863: June 24. Fort Bridger: *Daily Telegraph*. Hiram Brundage

[Clarence S. Brigham, *Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820*, serially in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, Vols. 23-37, 1913-1927; Alfred McClung Lee, *The Daily Newspaper in America*; James Melvin Lee, *History of American Journalism*]

DOUGLAS C. McMURTRIE

Newspapers as Political Organs. During the first half of the 19th century there were a number of newspapers, some of short existence, that were primarily organs of national political leaders. Most of them were established for that purpose, and came to an end when that purpose had been served. Some became independent journals, surviving this period of personal attachment. These papers were most useful in periods when political leaders lacked the resources and support of a strong party organization and found a substitute in responsive newspapers devoted to their political interests. The papers in return received the personal support of their patrons or a share of the public printing which the patrons could turn their way.

An early example is the *Gazette of the United States* (1789-1847), founded in New York as the organ of Alexander Hamilton. Its editor, John Fenno, moved the paper to Philadelphia with the transfer of the Federal capital, where it soon became a loyal journal of the Federalist party⁷⁰. Hamilton contributed articles to the paper, and used it in his controversies with Jefferson. He also helped it financially.

About two years later, the *National Gazette*⁷¹ (1791-94) was established in Philadelphia by Philip Freneau. It was the organ of Thomas Jefferson, if not, indeed, created through his efforts, and served as the antagonist of Hamilton and his paper. Jefferson gave its editor a position in his department of the government with a moderate salary.

When the capital was moved to Washington the *National Intelligencer*⁷² (1800-1870) was established there by Samuel Harrison Smith, allegedly as the political organ of Jefferson. Under its later owners and editors, Joseph Gales, Jr., and William Winston Seaton, the paper was identified with the successive administrations of Madison, Monroe and J. Q. Adams. Its stability was

assured by a share of the government printing (see Government Newspapers).

The *Washington Gazette* (1815-26), published and edited by Jonathan Elliot, served the presidential aspirations of William H. Crawford, especially in 1816 and 1824. He supported it with some of the printing patronage from the Government. It was sold in 1826 to the Jacksonians, after Crawford's political career had apparently ended.

The *Washington Republican* (1822-24) was created to promote John C. Calhoun's campaign for the Presidency in 1824. Its editor was Thomas L. McKenney, who had held a position in the War Department in which Calhoun was then secretary. When Calhoun decided to run for Vice-President instead, the paper was merged with the Adams organ, the *National Journal*, July 10, 1824.

The *National Journal* (1823-32), also of Washington, was the personal organ of John Quincy Adams in the campaign of 1824, and his administration organ after he became President. It also supported Calhoun for Vice-President in 1824. It was founded by Peter Force and published by him until nearly its end, with a number of others as editors, including Dr. Tobias Watkins and John Agg. It was given government printing by its patrons.

The *United States Telegraph* (1826-37) was established in Washington by personal friends of Andrew Jackson, among them John H. Eaton. Under its able editor and proprietor, Duff Green, it became the leading Jackson newspaper of the country, and was given a large share of the credit in securing his election in 1828. It was rewarded with government printing. It became for a while the administration organ but by 1831 was superseded by *The Globe*.

All the above newspapers were published in the national capital. There were a few papers published elsewhere that were important because of the political leaders connected with them.

The *Albany* (N. Y.) *Argus* (1813-1921) was noted as the political voice of Martin Van Buren and of his political friends who formed the so-called "Albany Regency."⁷³ They fed it the public printing of the state. Its most noted editor was Edwin Croswell (1824-54), one of the few great partisan editors of the period.

The *Albany* (N. Y.) *Evening Journal* (1830-1925) was established as an Anti-Masonic⁷⁴ newspaper, soon becoming Whig. But for its first thirty years it was identified with Thurlow Weed, celebrated New York Whig politician, who was its first and most notable editor.

The *Richmond Enquirer* (1804-77) was the

mouthpiece of a group of Virginia Democrats, known as the "Richmond Junto,"⁷⁰ which included Spencer Roane, Dr. John Brockenbrough and Thomas Ritchie. Under Ritchie's gifted editorship (1820-45) it became a power in Virginia and national politics.

The *Chicago Daily Times* (1854-60) was the political organ of Stephen A. Douglas. He was instrumental in establishing it and looked after its financial needs. Under the editorship of James W. Sheehan it was regarded by Lincoln as the ablest paper in the support of Douglas in the latter's senatorial contest with Lincoln. Douglas also had a close personal connection with the *Illinois State Register*, of Springfield, through Charles H. Lanphier, who was editor or proprietor from 1845 to 1863. In the same period the *Illinois State Journal* (originally the *Sangamon Journal*), under W. H. Bailhache and Edward L. Baker, served as a mouthpiece of Abraham Lincoln.

[Claude Bowers, *Party Battles of the Jackson Period*; Frederic Hudson, *Journalism in the United States*; W. O. Lynch, *Fifty Years of Party Warfare*; W. E. Smith, *The Francis Preston Blair Family in Politics*.]

CULVER H. SMITH

Newtown, Battle of. See Elmira, The Battle of.

Nez Percé, THE, were one of the most powerful of the Indian tribes of the Pacific Northwest. The early contacts with the whites were friendly—they helped Lewis and Clark⁷¹ and later welcomed the missionaries, to whose instruction they were responsive. Under the leadership of Dr. Elijah White, the first government Indian agent west of the Rockies, this tribe adopted a code of law in 1842. Despite these early friendly contacts, the last and most extensive Indian war of the Pacific Northwest was fought with this tribe. Hostilities broke out in 1876 as a result of efforts of the whites to settle in the Nez Percé country. The losing struggle was ably led by Chief Joseph (see Nez Percé War).

[George W. Fuller, *A History of the Pacific Northwest*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Nez Percé War (1877). In June, 1877, southern Nez Percés⁷² defied efforts of the Government to deprive them of their reservation in the Walla Walla Valley of Oregon (see Lapwai Indian Council). Gen. O. O. Howard marched against them but found in Joseph, their chief, an amazingly able opponent. The Nez Percés defeated the troops at White Bird Canyon, Idaho, June 17, and held their own at the Clearwater River, July 11.

Seeing he could not continue to hold off the

troops, Joseph, late in July, led his people across the Bitter Root Mountains. Evading a small fort he turned south. Gen. John Gibbon surprised him on the Big Hole River, Mont., Aug. 9, but was sharply defeated. Joseph continued south, almost trapping Howard at Camas Meadows, then turned north through Yellowstone Park. He beat off Col. Samuel D. Sturgis at Canyon Creek, Mont., Sept. 13, and marching northward, reached the Bear Paw Mountains, where, June 30, Gen. Nelson A. Miles surrounded him and forced his surrender.

In this remarkable campaign Joseph, with only 300 warriors, opposed 5000 soldiers, and actually met in battle 2000, of whom he killed or wounded 266. His own loss, including many women and children, was 239. He marched 2000 miles through enemy country, carrying his noncombatants, and came within thirty miles of his goal, the Canadian border.

[Cyrus Townsend Brady, *Northwestern Fights and Fighters*; C. A. Fee, *Chief Joseph*.]

PAUL I. WELLMAN

Niagara, Carrying Place of. Passage by water between lakes Ontario and Erie being obstructed by the great falls, a portage road of fourteen miles in length on the east side of the Niagara River was maintained by the French. In 1720 Louis Thomas de Joncaire, who was appointed master of the portage, having obtained permission from the Senecas⁷³, constructed the Magasin Royal, a trading house of bark surrounded by a palisade, at the lower landing of the portage, now Lewiston, N. Y. This storehouse of the French trade was occupied by the elder Joncaire until his death in 1739. Realizing the importance of this road, which was the means of communication between the posts below the falls and the upper lakes⁷⁴ as well as the coveted Ohio region, Daniel de Joncaire, who had succeeded his father, erected Fort Little Niagara in 1751 at the upper landing. This was a palisaded post on the east shore of the river at the head of the portage road. The thoroughfare facilitated transportation of supplies destined for the new posts and those already established to the south and west. Although the English had established a post at Oswego⁷⁵ they were prevented from entering the upper lakes.

Fort Little Niagara was destroyed by its commandant July 7, 1759, when the British attacked Fort Niagara⁷⁶. After becoming masters of the portage, the British fully realized its importance, and in 1764 received from the Senecas by treaty the full right to its possession. Its importance was demonstrated in the relief of Detroit, during

Pontiac's War⁹⁹, and in control of the upper lakes until relinquished, under the Jay Treaty⁹⁹, in 1796 (*see* Border Forts, The Evacuation of).

[Frank H. Severance, *An Old Frontier of France*.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Niagara, Fort. Permission having been obtained from the Senecas⁹⁹ by the French, a stone castle was built on the eastern shore of Niagara River at Lake Ontario in 1726, six and one-half miles north of the Niagara Carrying Place⁹⁹. Palisades, ramparts and other buildings soon followed and this post became the principal guard of the coveted gateway to the rich fur lands in the West. A projected attack by the English under Gen. Shirley in 1757 failed. Two years later, a force of British and Indians under Generals Prideaux and Johnson besieged the fortress. Prideaux was killed and Sir William Johnson, succeeding to the command, captured the post on July 25. As a British fortress, it was the scene of several Indian treaties, and during the Revolution the irregulars under Butler and Johnson issued from its gates bound on their devastating forays. After the war, the surrounding territory was governed from Niagara until the fortress was relinquished to the American troops in August, 1796 (*see* Border Forts, The Evacuation of), in accordance with the Jay Treaty⁹⁹. Captured by the British on Dec. 19, 1813, it was returned to the United States under the Treaty of Ghent⁹⁹.

[Frank H. Severance, *An Old Frontier of France*; Robert W. Bingham, *The Cradle of the Queen City*.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Niagara, Great Indian Council at (1764). Sir William Johnson notified all of the rebellious Indian nations of the intended expeditions of the English under Bradstreet and Bouquet⁹⁹, requesting those desirous of making peace to meet him at Niagara, in July. In response, deputations including Ottawas, Hurons, Menominee, Chippewa, Iroquois⁹⁹ and others began to arrive at Fort Niagara⁹⁹. By the time the council convened on July 9, 2060 Indians were assembled—the largest number ever gathered together for a peace conference. On the 18th of July a treaty was concluded with the Hurons which ceded lands in their country lying on both sides of the strait to Lake St. Clair. The Senecas⁹⁹ who arrived later signed a treaty on Aug. 6, which ceded to the crown the four-mile strip⁹⁹ on each side of the Niagara River, and gave the islands above the falls to Sir William Johnson. The other nations made no formal treaties, declaring they had come only to renew their friendship.

[A. C. Flick, ed., *The Sir William Johnson Papers*, Vol. IV.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Niagara Campaigns (1812–14). On Oct. 13, 1812, Gen. Van Rensselaer crossed the Niagara River and attacked the British at Queenston⁹⁹, but lack of reinforcements finally caused the Americans to retire. On May 27, 1813, Col. Scott, assisted by Chauncey's fleet, captured Fort George⁹⁹, and the British abandoned the entire Niagara frontier to the American troops. Gen. McClure, destroying Fort George and Newark on Dec. 10, retreated to Fort Niagara⁹⁹. The British captured Fort Niagara on the 19th, and burned the villages of Youngstown, Lewiston and Manchester. Again crossing the river on Dec. 30, they defeated the Americans at Black Rock, burning that settlement and the village of Buffalo. The Americans, under Generals Brown and Scott, captured Fort Erie⁹⁹, July 3, 1814, and marching north, defeated the enemy at Chippewa⁹⁹ on the 5th. After the battle of Lundy's Lane⁹⁹ on the 25th, with both sides claiming victory, the Americans withdrew to Fort Erie. The British army under Lt. Col. Drummond arrived before the fortress, Aug. 1, and began a siege which was raised, Sept. 17, by the sortie of Gen. Porter's volunteers. This was the last important engagement in the campaigns on the Niagara.

[Louis L. Babcock, *The War of 1812 on the Niagara Frontier*.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Niagara Company, THE (1788). Various interests in the Indian lands in central New York, obtained through co-operation with the Phelps-Gorham Company⁹⁹, occasioned Lt. Col. John Butler, Capt. Powell, Lt. Johnston and Lt. Dockstotter of the British Indian Department, and Messrs. Street, Barton & Murphy to form the Niagara Company with a holding of fourteen shares consisting of 20,000 acres each in the Genesee lands. An investigation by the British authorities caused a relinquishment of the majority of the lands.

[Robert W. Bingham, *The Cradle of the Queen City*.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Niagara Falls. In the Niagara River between lakes Erie and Ontario is one of the "Seven Wonders of the World." The great cataract, composed of the American Falls and the Canadian or Horseshoe Falls separated by Goat Island, rushes over the precipice to descend 164 feet to the lower river. From the head of the upper rapids, which extend one mile above the falls, to the end of the escarpment below, the river has a fall of 314 feet, a natural source of power that was realized by Augustus and Peter B. Porter. In 1825 they sought to interest Eastern capitalists in its development. In 1847 the Hydraulic Canal

project was the beginning of the movement which culminated in 1886 with the formation of the Niagara Falls Power Company.

The first white man to view the cataract and describe it was Father Louis Hennepin^m who journeyed there in 1678. An obstacle to navigation, it occasioned the famous portage road that was so jealously guarded by both France and England (*see* Niagara, Carrying Place of). It made Fort Niagara^m the most coveted post in the New World and gave to the power that held it absolute control of the upper lakes^m and the great natural resources that abounded in their valleys.

[Edward D. Adams, *Niagara Power*.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Niagara Falls, Peace Conference at. *See* Peace Movement in 1864.

Niagara Suspension Bridges. Proposed 1844, chartered 1846, the first bridge was started by flying kites over the Niagara Gorge at the Whirlpool Rapids. A footbridge was completed in 1848 and the railroad bridge finished by John A. Roebling in 1855. It was replaced in 1897 by a double-deck steel bridge for railroad above and road below. The Upper Falls Bridge or Falls View, begun during the winter 1867-68 by rope carried over the ice bridge, was opened in 1869, ten feet wide. In 1887-88 wood was replaced by steel and the bridge widened, but it was blown down by a hurricane in 1889. The new steel bridge lasted 1889 to 1897 when it was replaced by a steel arch bridge (crushed by ice in 1938). A new concrete bridge was authorized in 1939, to be completed in 1941. The Lewiston suspension bridge, built 1850-51, lasted till 1861, and was replaced in 1899 by a suspension bridge.

AUGUSTUS H. SHEARER

Niblo's Garden was a famous resort on lower Broadway in New York City, presenting for several decades grand opera, concert and the play. It was opened in 1824, destroyed by fire in 1846, reopened 1849, burned again in 1872, rebuilt again, became a concert hall and was finally demolished in 1895. *The Black Crook* was first presented there in 1866.

[I. N. Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Nicaragua, Relations with, have had the Nicaraguan canal project^m for an underlying motive. The dictatorial policy of the Zelaya regime (1893-1909) brought Nicaragua into conflict with the United States. Consequently, the conservative

revolution of 1909 was favored by the United States, and, when it succeeded, the new government appealed to the State Department for counsel and assistance in its difficulties. The so-called Dawson pacts (1910) indicated a basis for the future relations of the two countries. The remedy for the ills of Nicaragua has had three phases: fiscal, military and electoral. The Knox Castrillo loan convention (1911) was not ratified. Nevertheless, fiscal assistance was afforded through the bankers' contracts which provided for short-term loans (1911 ff), the customs service (1911), the national bank (1912), the monetary reform (1912), the management of the Pacific Railroad (1913), three claims commissions (1911, 1917, 1927), the High Commission (1917) and two financial plans (1917, 1920), in all of which Americans participated. The Bryan-Chamorro Canal Treaty^m also brought fiscal aid to Nicaragua. Although the Dawson pacts covered both financial and political matters, the United States placed emphasis upon the former. It could not, however, escape having an influence, indirectly at least, in the matter of elections, which for two decades kept in power the leaders of the Bluefields Revolution of 1909. Complaints of the opposition to the electoral procedure led to suggestions for reform, and in 1922 Dr. H. W. Dodds drafted a law which in a somewhat modified form has been used in the elections since 1924.

During the Mena Revolution in 1912, marines were landed and participated in the pacification of the country. Thereafter until August, 1923, a small legation guard was maintained in Managua. Its withdrawal precipitated a bitter revolutionary struggle which caused the return of the marines in 1926. The revolution of 1926-27 was terminated through the efforts of Col. Henry L. Stimson, personal representative of President Coolidge, who secured the disarmament of both liberal and conservative factions and accepted on behalf of the United States the task of supervising the elections. Under this agreement, the presidential elections of 1928 and 1932 were conducted under the direction of Americans. Meanwhile, a Nicaraguan constabulary was organized and instructed by officers and men of the United States Marine Corps^m. Upon the accession to the presidency of Dr. Juan B. Sacasa, the marines were withdrawn on Jan. 2, 1933. Since that date, the United States has maintained friendly relations with the Nicaraguan government, even though in 1936 a political maneuver resulted in the resignation of President Sacasa and the chief of the National Guard, Gen. Anastasio Somoza, was elected to the presidency.

[Roscoe R. Hill, chapters on Central America in A.

C. Wilgus, *The Caribbean Area*; Department of State, *The United States and Nicaragua, 1909-1932*]

ROSCOE R. HILL

Nicaraguan Canal Project, THE, for an inter-oceanic waterway along the San Juan River and Lake Nicaragua has long been considered. A Spanish engineer first surveyed the route in the 18th century. Independent Central America was interested and Napoleon III considered the project. The route was the object of six treaties between the United States and Nicaragua during the 19th century, as well as of a treaty and an arbitration between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. England had claims which were considered in the negotiation of the Clayton-Bulwer (1850) and the Hay-Pauncefote (1901) treaties⁹⁹. The Nicaraguan Canal Association, an American corporation, made a contract with Nicaragua in 1887 to build a canal, and the Maritime Canal Company was formed to carry it out. After a survey, construction was undertaken but suspended when funds could not be secured. The United States Government in 1895 began investigations and received a favorable report on the project from the Ludlow Commission. In 1897-99 the Isthmian Canal Commission⁹⁹ made a complete survey and report. By the Hay-Corea (1900) and the Sanchez-Merry (1901) protocols with Nicaragua and the Hay-Calvo with Costa Rica (1900) steps were taken by the United States looking toward a Nicaraguan canal. Political and other factors resulted in the adoption of the Panama route (see Panama Canal), and the Nicaraguan project was postponed. It, however, played an important part in the relations between the United States and Nicaragua after 1910. The Bryan-Chamorro Treaty⁹⁹ (1914) gave the United States an option on the route. Interest in this project was given by President Coolidge in 1927 as the reason for the return of the marines to Nicaragua. A new survey of the Nicaraguan route by army engineers was authorized by Congress (March 2, 1929). The report (1931) was favorable to a Nicaraguan canal whenever the Panama Canal should become inadequate; hence, interest in a second interoceanic canal continues.

[Roscoe R. Hill, *The Interoceanic Canal and Central American Union*, in A. C. Wilgus, *The Caribbean Area*.]

ROSCOE R. HILL

Nichols Pond, in Madison County, N. Y., was probably the site of a palisaded fortification of the Oneidas⁹⁹, which Champlain attacked, on Oct. 10, 1615, with a band of Hurons⁹⁹ and nine Frenchmen. A small movable tower was constructed to command the stronghold, but the

Hurons impatiently tried a direct assault. They were repulsed and Champlain was wounded.

[W. M. Beauchamp, *Aboriginal Occupation of New York; The Historical Writings of the Late Orsamus H. Marshall*.]

EDWARD P. ALEXANDER

Nickel Industry, THE, in the United States begins with 1862 when the Lancaster Gap mine in Pennsylvania, which had been sporadically worked as a copper mine since its first discovery about 1718 and as a nickel mine since 1852, was put on an operating basis by Joseph Wharton to supply metal for the copper-nickel coins which had been authorized in 1857. Its chief historical interest attaches to the political pressure brought on Congress to continue the use of nickel in subsidiary coinage⁹⁹, and assure the use of domestically produced nickel for that purpose. The deposit was small and in 1880 production ceased. About that time R. M. Thompson and the Orford Copper Company were attempting to perfect a commercial process, at Constable Hook, N. J., for the treatment of nickel-bearing copper ores from Quebec. The process was successful, and more adequate ore deposits than the original ones were later secured by a merger with the Canadian Copper Company, which had obtained the properties in Ontario now operated by the International Nickel Company. The latter was originally an American company, importing its raw material from Canada. Nationalistic feeling in Canada, which became acute in 1917, eventually forced the International Nickel to re-incorporate as a Canadian company and perform most of its smelting and refining in Canada, though most of the product is exported to the United States. The only domestic production in the United States of nickel is a small amount obtained as a by-product from copper refining.

[*Royal Ontario Nickel Commission Report, 1917*; Neil Carothers, *Fractional Money*, J. F. Kemp, *The Nickel Mine at Lancaster Gap*, in *Trans. Amer. Inst. Min. Eng.*, Vol. 24.]

T. T. READ

Nicolas, Conspiracy of. Nicolas (or Orontony), a Huron chief, removed with his people from the French post of Detroit⁹⁹ to Sandusky Bay where he permitted Pennsylvania traders to erect a blockhouse in 1745. Nicolas presently plotted a concerted attack upon French posts by an alliance of various Northwestern tribes, but premature acts of violence put the French upon their guard, Detroit was reinforced, and Nicolas and his allies reluctantly submitted. He fled to the Indiana country in 1748 to escape French vengeance.

[E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, *History of Ohio*, Vol. I.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Nicolet, Explorations of. The personal explorations of Champlain⁷ terminated with his voyage to Georgian Bay and Huronia in 1615-16. Soon thereafter he adopted the policy of selecting promising youths to send among the Indians, to master, by such residence, the lore of the American wilderness.

Jean Nicolet was a native of Cherbourg who came to Canada in 1618 and was immediately sent by Champlain to Allumettes Island in the Ottawa River. After a two-year apprenticeship here, he was assigned to the distant Nipissing, living northward of the lake which bears their name. Here he remained several years, sharing the life of the natives and keeping, for Champlain's benefit, a careful memoir of his observations.

In 1633 he was called back to civilization and appointed interpreter at Three Rivers. From here, the following year, he was despatched in search of the "People of the Sea" who were at war with the Huron tribe, and who were surmised to have some connection with the realm of Tartary, which Marco Polo had described.

No direct record of Nicolet's voyage remains. Chiefly from contemporary Jesuit⁷ reports we learn that he journeyed by the Ottawa River north to Georgian Bay, passed through the Straits of Mackinac, and skirted the coast of Lake Michigan as far as Green Bay. Thereby he became the first known white visitor to Michigan and Wisconsin and the discoverer of Lake Michigan.

Upon this achievement his fame chiefly rests. From the scanty contemporary sources, several modern historians have spun tales of the voyage which are largely fanciful; the solid achievement of Nicolet stands in need of no embellishment.

[M. M. Quaife, *Wisconsin: Its History and Its People*; R. G. Thwaites, ed., *The Jesuit Relations*, Vols. XVIII, XXIII.]

M. M. QUAIFE

Nicolls' Commission (1664-65) was given by Charles II to Col. Richard Nicolls and three others who were sent to America with a fleet to conquer New Netherland⁷ from the Dutch. They were commanded, in addition, to visit New England and to investigate boundary disputes, state of defenses, laws passed during the Puritan Revolution, attitude toward the new acts of trade and in general the religious, economic and political conditions. As they moved from place to place they were to hear complaints and appeals and to make such decisions as to them seemed necessary. Their private instructions enlarged upon these powers and objectives and cautioned them to make it clear that the king

had no intention of altering church government in the colonies in any way, or of introducing any other form of worship there, but that he insisted upon the freedom of conscience required by charter and denied to many people by the governments of the New England colonies. Two additional matters the king hoped the commissioners could manage; that they could persuade those colonies to consent to the king's nominating or approving of their governors and appointing or recommending the chief officer of their militia. Though courteously received in southern New England, in Massachusetts they met with difficulties and opposition at every turn. In their final report they therefore not only listed against Massachusetts irregularities of all kinds, but also an arrogant and defiant attitude which promised little hope of a friendly and peaceable settlement of the difficulties attending the administration of a colonial policy in New England.

[H. L. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, Vol. III, J. R. Brodhead, *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of New York*, Vol. III.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

Night Clubs. National Prohibition⁷ led after-theater restaurants, cafés and cabarets about 1921 to pose as clubs, though seldom requiring formal membership. These night clubs offered food, dancing and entertainment, generally in the form of a "floor show," and permitted the sale or at least the consumption of alcoholic beverages in violation of the Volstead Act⁷. They were often (1924-29) identified with a personality, such as the "hostess" Texas Guinan or the "torch" singer Helen Morgan, and were characterized by an intimate atmosphere, general informality, exorbitant prices and a "cover charge," virtually a price of admission. The night club was intrinsically a product of prohibition, but with the repeal (1933) of the Volstead Act has persisted through changes in manners and taste as a center of night life.

[S. Walker, *The Night Club Era*; J. Durante, *Night Clubs*.]

STANLEY R. PILLSBURY

Night Riders or the "Silent Brigade" were armed bands who attacked opponents of tobacco pools in Kentucky and Tennessee (1905-8). They were publicly denounced, but perhaps secretly encouraged, by the co-operative leaders. Hundreds of farmers who refused to join had their barns burned or crops destroyed.

In the "Black Patch" (dark tobacco section of southwest Kentucky and northern Tennessee) large bands of armed, mounted men made successful raids upon market towns, burning the warehouses of the "Tobacco Trust," at Russell-

ville, Elkton, Princeton and Hopkinsville, Ky. Judges and juries were influenced or intimidated to prevent convictions.

After 1908, with the backing of Gov. A. E. Willson, several "riders" were punished and others were sued successfully in the Federal courts. Although the tobacco co-operativessm succeeded in raising prices, the criminal activities of some of their members caused the disbandment of the organizations between 1909 and 1921.

[J. O. Nall, *The Tobacco Night Riders*.]

W. C. MALLALIEU

Niles' Weekly Register (Sept. 7, 1811-June 27, 1849) was a tabloid-size newspaper without pictures founded at Baltimore by Hezekiah Niles. It was made up largely of extracts from other newspapers from all over the country. The aim was an impartial chronicle of passing events, with a minimum of editorial opinion. It had a national circulation, was contemporarily respected and much quoted, and has since become popular with historians as source material. Its name was changed to *Niles' National Register* in 1837. The entire series has been reprinted in seventy-five volumes.

[James Melvin Lee, *History of American Journalism*.]

CULVER H. SMITH

Nine-foot Channel, THE, on the upper Mississippi between St. Louis and Minneapolis, was authorized by Congress in 1930 with the purpose of restoring river traffic. The project aimed at slack-water navigation by means of twenty-six locks and dams, and was designed particularly to promote barge freighting. It was included in the Federal works program in 1933. The northern section of the channel was opened five years later and the completion of the project as a whole planned for 1940 (*see Lakes-to-Gulf Deep Waterway*).

[M. L. Hartsough, *From Canoe to Steel Barge on the Mississippi*.]

T. C. BLEGEN

Nine-Power Pact, THE, between the United States, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and Portugal, was concluded at the Washington Naval Conferencesm on Feb. 6, 1922. Japan's "Twenty-one Demands" on China in 1915 and the Japanese "Monroe Doctrine" had created a delicate international situation impairing the territorial integrity of China and endangering the Open Doorsm principle.

In order to stabilize conditions in the Far East and to safeguard the rights and interests of China, the powers agreed to respect her sovereignty, independence, and territorial and administrative

integrity, maintain the principle of the Open Door, and refrain from seeking special rights or privileges for their own citizens. The pact was an international guarantee of the Open Door and China's integrity, and effected (1923) the cancellation of the Lansing-Ishii Agreementsm of 1917.

Completely disregarding the treaty, Japan in 1931 seized Manchuria. Protesting, the United States proclaimed the Stimson nonrecognition doctrinesm (1932). Following Japan's invasion of China in 1937, the Brussels Conference (November, 1937) censured Japan and reaffirmed the principles of the pact. Refusing to recognize Japan's "special position" in China, the United States in July, 1939, notified Japan of her intention to terminate, at the end of six months, the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of 1911.

[H. B. Morse and H. F. MacNair, *Far Eastern International Relations*; Norman D. Davis, *Europe and the East*.]

GLENN H. BENTON

Nineteenth Amendment, THE. The movement for this enactment, which gave women the vote, began at the Seneca Falls Conventionsm of 1848, when, on the insistence of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, a resolution was adopted declaring "That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise." Following the Civil War continuous work began for adoption of an amendment to the national Constitution stating that "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex."

On Jan. 9, 1918, President Woodrow Wilson came out in favor of the amendment, and the next day the House of Representatives passed it; but the Senate failed to act before Congress ended. In May, 1919, soon after the 66th Congress met, the House again acted favorably, and on June 4, 1919, the Senate gave approval. Wisconsin, the first state to ratify, acted June 10, 1919. On Aug. 18, 1920, Tennessee, the thirty-sixth, cast the decisive favorable vote, making the measure part of the law of the land.

[E. C. Stanton, S. V. Anthony, M. J. Gage, I. H. Harper, eds., *The History of Woman Suffrage*.]

MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS

Ninety-Six, a village in western South Carolina, and a British fortified post during the Revolutionary Warsm, was besieged by the Americans under Gen. Greene for twenty-eight days in May and June, 1781. A desperate assault on June 17 failed, and the approach of Lord Rawdon with 2000 British forced Greene, who had only 1000 men, to raise the siege on the 19th. But the post

was too far inland for Rawdon to hold, and he abandoned it June 29 and retired toward the coast.

[G. W. Greene, *Life of Major-General Nathanael Greene*.]
ALVIN F. HARLOW

"Ninety-Two" and "Forty-Five" were political catchwords first used together in 1768 "Forty-five" referred to No. 45 of John Wilkes' paper *The North Briton*, published in London, April 23, 1763, which involved its publisher in a battle for the freedom of the press. "Ninety-two" was the number of the members of the Massachusetts Assembly who refused, June 30, 1768, to rescind the Massachusetts Circular Letter⁷⁷ (Feb. 11, 1768) against the suppression of colonial liberties. A favorite toast became: "May the unrescinding ninety-two be forever united in idea with the glorious forty-five." These numbers were combined in great variety in the colonies before the Revolution.

[R. Frothingham, *The Rise of the Republic of the United States*.]
STANLEY R. PILLSBURY

Nisqually, Fort, Attack on (May, 1849) Established in 1833 on the direct overland route between forts Vancouver and Langley, this fort developed into an agricultural, commercial and protective center. In 1849, angered with the Oregon territorial government, the Snoqualimich Indians tried to capture it but failed. The defenders appealed to Gov. Lane, who sent the entire territorial army, Lt. Hawkins and five men! The fortunate arrival from Honolulu of a steamer carrying two companies of artillery saved the day. Had the Indians triumphed, no white settler would have survived on Puget Sound.

[H. H. Bancroft, *History of Oregon*, Charles Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition*.]
ROBERT S. THOMAS

Nitrates. Of the several salts of nitric acid, those of potassium and of sodium have had largest commercial use. Potassium nitrate (saltpeter) has been employed for centuries in the manufacture of gunpowder and of fireworks, and in the curing of meats. Sodium nitrate (Chile salt-peter), also used in the manufacture of explosives and other chemicals, has been of greatest importance as a fertilizer⁷⁸.

Before 1850 nitrogenous fertilizers were supplied mainly in insoluble organic form—manures and wastes of various kinds. Before the nitrogen they contained could be absorbed by the plant, it had to be "nitrified," i. e., transformed by bacterio-chemical action into nitrates, a slow uncertain process.

The discovery of the vast deposits of nitrate

of soda in a rainless region in Chile, Peru and Bolivia, exerted a far-reaching influence upon world industry and agriculture. What is probably the oldest description of these deposits was published about 1820, and exportation began in 1830. As the native fertility of American soils became exhausted, the demand for nitrogenous fertilizers increased. Tests at agricultural experiment stations⁷⁹ between 1880 and 1900 demonstrated that nitrate of soda, being readily soluble in the soil moisture, was one of the most dependable and economical sources of nitrogen for plant growth. Consequently its use spread rapidly, particularly for truck crops and as supplementary treatment for grain, forage crops, cotton and tobacco. Imports of Chilean nitrate into the United States rose to 146,000 tons in 1898, and from 1916 to 1930 averaged more than 1,000,000 tons annually.

The virtual monopoly which the Chilean interests held for many years was broken with the development of the manufacture of synthetic nitrogen products by the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen. Although this electrochemical process had its birth at Niagara Falls in 1902, little nitrogen was fixed in the United States until after the World War. The production of synthetic nitrate of soda on a commercial scale began in this country in 1929, and since then has steadily increased, while the importations of Chilean nitrate have substantially declined.

[*Book of Rural Life*, Vol. 7, A. R. Merz and C. G. Fletcher, *Production and Agricultural Use of Sodium Nitrate*, U. S. Dept. Agr. Circ., 436.]

CARL R. WOODWARD

No Man's Land. See Cimarron, Proposed Territory of.

No Man's Land was a World War term, popularly coined, applicable to the terrain between opposing forces which is not definitely held by either combatant.

ROBERT S. THOMAS

"No Peace Beyond the Line." This phrase, colorfully depicting the international rivalry for the New World, had its origins in the refusal of Spain and Portugal to concede rights to others within the monopolies fixed by the line of demarcation⁸⁰. Diplomats, unable to agree on this question, elected, as in the Franco-Spanish peace of 1559 and the Anglo-Spanish Treaty of 1604, to omit all reference to it, rather than to sacrifice the benefits of a European peace. Thus, it was understood (in 1559 by oral agreement) that European treaties lost their force west of the prime meridian (sometimes identified as passing through the Azores and sometimes as being iden-

tical with the Demarcation Line) and south of the Tropic of Cancer. Beyond these indefinite "lines of amity" hostile acts did not technically break the peace in Europe, though they might well strain it to a breaking point. The Treaty of Madrid⁹⁹ in 1670, and subsequent agreements among the maritime powers, reached through the years prior to 1685, mark the most significant steps in the gradual abandonment of this rule for one holding that the peace of Europe governed as well "beyond the line."

[A. P. Newton, *The European Nations in the West Indies, 1493-1688*; A. P. Higgins, in *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, Vol. I; F. G. Davenport, *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and Its Dependencies*.]

WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

Nobel Prizes. Among the major countries, the United States was slow to gain recognition through the Nobel Prizes (first awarded in 1901). Only two prizes were awarded to its citizens during the first decade of the awards, and only four during the second. The third decade, however, proved more favorable, when five prizes were awarded to six American recipients (sometimes a prize is divided), and the fourth decade, which will not be complete before the awards for 1940 are known, has already brought nine prizes (for thirteen recipients) to the United States.

The Peace Prize, which went to Theodore Roosevelt in 1906 (*see* Portsmouth, Treaty of), was the first prize awarded to an American, and has continued as the one most frequently awarded to Americans (five and one-half prizes to seven recipients). In Physiology and Medicine there have been four awards (six recipients) to United States citizens; in Physics, four and one-half (six recipients); in Chemistry, three to as many recipients; and in Literature also three to the same number of recipients. There was no award in Literature to an American for three decades until Sinclair Lewis was so honored in 1930.

[Ragnar Sohlman and Henrik Schück, *Nobel: Dynasts and Peace*; T. W. MacCallum and S. Taylor, *The Nobel Prize Winners and the Nobel Foundation*.]

OSCAR J. FALNES

Nobility, Titles of. While sundry traces of feudalism appear in colonial law and governmental practice, and British peers and gentry played an important part in the founding and development of the thirteen colonies, conditions did not favor the establishment of a titled aristocracy. John Locke's fantastic scheme for the Carolinas came to nothing (*see* Carolina, The Fundamental Constitutions of). Few colonials were honored. William Phips, born in Maine, was knighted in 1687, William Pepperell, of the same

region, was made a baronet in 1746, and William Johnson, of New York, received the same honor in 1755. The Revolution definitely committed the country to a republican system, and the Constitution prohibited the conferring of titles of nobility by either the United States or the states (Art. I, Secs. 9, 10). Federal officials were likewise forbidden to accept titles from foreign states except with consent of the Congress. Federalist⁹⁹ leaders were constantly charged with "aristocratic" leanings, but while frankly supporting the idea that the wise, the good and the rich⁹⁹ should dominate, they relied on restricted suffrage and natural influence to maintain their status.

W. A. ROBINSON

Noddles Island, Skirmish on (May 27, 1775). A band of colonials crossed to Noddles Island (Boston) to drive off livestock and secure fodder. There they battled a British marine guard, killing two and wounding two. Securing some of the livestock and firing several buildings and a quantity of hay, the colonials departed before British reinforcements from the fleet could land.

[Henry B. Dawson, *Battles of the United States by Sea and Land*.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Nogales, Treaty of. In the spring of 1792, complying with the Spanish plan of reorganizing and strengthening the defense of Louisiana, Gayoso, commandant at Natchez, negotiated a treaty with the Choctaws and Chickasaws validating the Spanish seizure of Walnut Hills⁹⁹. Gayoso then erected, fortified and garrisoned Fort Nogales, after which the Spanish officials began building a system of Indian alliances to support the military defense of the Mississippi. The "capstone" of this policy (*see* Chickasaw-Creek War, 1793) was the Treaty of Nogales, Oct. 28, 1793, negotiated with the Creeks (who were induced to repudiate the Treaty of New York), the Choctaws, Chickasaws and Cherokees⁹⁹. This treaty reaffirmed the alliance and commerce treaties of 1784 (*see* Spanish-Indian Relations) and the reciprocal offensive-defensive alliance. The Indians agreed to defend Louisiana and Florida against attack and invoked Spanish assistance in securing boundary settlements with the United States. Annual supplies and presents were to be delivered to the tribes and Spain guaranteed protection "in all cases in which they may need it." By inciting the Indians to burn and ravage the American settlements from Georgia to the Mississippi, the Spanish authorities hoped to compel the United States to respect Indian lands and thus create a barrier that would protect Louisiana. The United States protested this pol-

icy, but received only evasive promises of correction. Meanwhile, Spanish authorities at New Orleans continued to stir the Indians to action and renewed separatist negotiations with the Kentuckians (*see* Spanish Conspiracy). Intrigue, uncertainty and occasional Indian depredations continued until ended by Pinckney's Treaty⁹⁷ which provided for a new southern boundary⁹⁸ and the Spanish evacuation of the posts on the Mississippi (*see* Guion's Expedition, 1797).

[S. F. Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*, Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana: Spanish Domination*]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Nolan, Expeditions of. At least four expeditions into Texas were made by Philip Nolan, an American trader and filibusterer from Kentucky. On the first expedition (1792-94) he gathered and sold skins and drove a herd of horses to Louisiana. He made a second expedition to San Antonio in 1794-96. Through connivance with local Spanish officials he brought back 250 horses which he sold in Natchez and in Kentucky.

Returning to Texas from Kentucky, Nolan met Andrew Ellicott going to Natchez to begin surveying the southern boundary⁹⁹. Protected with a Spanish passport, Nolan penetrated into Texas as far as the Rio Grande, returning with some 1300 horses. When he proposed a fourth expedition, he was refused a passport and Spanish officials were warned to arrest him on sight. In a skirmish near the present Waco, Texas, with a detachment sent from Nacogdoches¹⁰⁰, Nolan was killed, March 21, 1801.

[See sketch of Philip Nolan, in *Dictionary of American Biography*, Vol. XIII.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Nominating System. In the operation of the American representative system of government some method of nominating candidates for the various offices is essential. To meet this need three chief methods have been devised. These are the caucus system, which prevailed prior to 1824; the convention system, which became the chief method about 1830; and the direct primary system¹⁰¹, which was introduced in 1903.

Originated early in the 18th century, in connection with local elections, the caucus system was later adapted to the nomination of governors and other state officers. Members of the legislature belonging to the same party would meet to recommend candidates. The next development was the congressional caucus¹⁰² wherein members of Congress having the same party affiliation would assemble for the purpose of recommending presidential and vice-presidential candidates.

Used first in 1800, the congressional caucus functioned for the last time in the campaign of

1824¹⁰³. In a country which was becoming increasingly democratic, it was denounced as being out of tune with the times.

Meanwhile there was developing in the states the delegate convention system. Delaware took the lead in setting up a convention during the administration of Jefferson. By 1830 state conventions prevailed everywhere except in the South.

Before the system was adapted to the national scene, there was a period of transition from the congressional caucus. In the campaign of 1824, Crawford received the caucus nomination, but three of the presidential candidates, Adams, Clay and Jackson, were nominated more informally by mass meetings, by newspapers, or by state legislative caucuses. In the next campaign, both Adams and Jackson were nominated by similar methods.

In 1831, however, the Anti-Masonic party¹⁰⁴, after a preliminary convention held in the previous year, inaugurated the national nominating convention¹⁰⁵. The National Republicans and the Democrats followed the example, with the result that the national nominating convention became the accepted method of nominating party candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency while state conventions controlled the selection of candidates for state offices.

From the beginning the convention system was subjected to much severe criticism. As the years passed, the conviction grew that party conventions were so easily controlled by political bosses that their selections were not representative of the will of the party members. As an outgrowth of the dissatisfaction, the direct-primary system was developed. Originated in Wisconsin in 1903, the primary election system provides for the direct selection of party candidates by popular vote under state supervision. Generally, but not always, the primary election is "closed" to all but party members.

Advocated as a device to "return the government to the people," the primary system was adopted in some form in all but five states, by 1915. By the next year, it had been adopted in twenty-two states for the selection of delegates to national nominating conventions. Though subjected to severe criticism, some of which has certainly been merited, the direct-primary system has been firmly established as the most important nominating method in the 20th-century United States.

[Robert C. Brooks, *Political Parties and Electoral Problems*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Nonconformists. *See* Dissenters.

Nonimportation Agreements, THE, were the colonies' chief weapon against Great Britain in the struggle for American liberty waged from 1765 to 1775. For a decade before the outbreak of war, Americans attempted to force the mother country to recognize their political rights by means of economic coercion; the failure to achieve their purpose by this means led many colonial Whigs reluctantly to regard war as the only safeguard of their liberties.

Nonimportation was first used against Great Britain by the New York merchants when, in 1765, they countermanded their orders for British merchandise and declared that they would order no more goods until the Stamp Act⁷⁰ was repealed—an example that was quickly followed by the Boston and Philadelphia merchants. Thoroughly alarmed at the prospect of losing their lucrative colonial trade, the British merchants and manufacturers lobbied so vigorously in Parliament that the Stamp Act was repealed largely through their efforts.

Many colonial Whigs concluded from this victory that they had found a certain defense against the centralizing schemes of British imperialists. Although Englishmen might be deaf to appeals to natural law and charter rights, they seemed to lose no time in coming to term with the colonies when pinched in their pocketbooks. Therefore, when the Townshend⁷¹ duties threatened colonial liberty, Americans again resorted to a boycott of British goods. Beginning in Boston in 1768, the nonimportation agreement was rapidly extended over the colonies with varying degrees of thoroughness and effectiveness. Tory merchants who refused to join the agreement were terrorized by mobs and compelled to cease importing British goods. Leadership of the movement soon passed from the Whig merchants to the radical Sons of Liberty⁷² who insisted that it be protracted until all colonial grievances, not merely the Townshend duties, had been redressed.

In 1769 the British government repealed all the Townshend duties except the tax on tea. This concession proved fatal to the nonimportation agreement. The New York merchants, outraged by Newport's open flouting of the agreement and suspicious of Boston's good faith, determined in 1770 to open their port to all British merchandise except tea. Although Boston and Philadelphia attempted to continue the struggle, New York's defection soon brought about the collapse of the boycott.

Economic coercion of the mother country was again attempted by the formation of the Continental Association in 1774. This differed from

previous colonial boycotts inasmuch as it was imposed by the Continental Congress⁷³, contained provisions for nonexportation as well as nonimportation, and was controlled by the people, working through committees, rather than by the merchants. Nevertheless, the Continental Association failed to fulfil the hopes of conservative patriots who regarded it as a certain means of averting war. The British merchants and manufacturers, upon whom Americans relied to exert pressure upon the British government for a redress of colonial grievances, discovered new sources of trade to replace the lost American market; and, instead of rallying to the defense of the colonies, they permitted the Ministry a free hand in dealing with the American controversy. The supineness of the British merchants and manufacturers destroyed the plans of conservative American Whigs for a peaceful settlement; and the Continental Association had not been in effect six months before it was clear that the dispute between mother country and colonies was not to be decided by a bloodless economic war.

[A. M. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution, 1763-1776*.] JOHN C. MILLER

Nonintercourse Act, THE. Commercial restrictions were an early and prominent ingredient in American foreign policy⁷⁴. Washington and the Federalists experimented with them, but it remained for Jefferson and his Republicans to realize their fullest possibilities. In the first decade of the 19th century there were four major acts restricting commerce, the partial Nonintercourse Act, of April 18, 1806, suspended on Dec. 19 of that year; the Embargo Act⁷⁵, of Dec. 22, 1807, which expired in March, 1809; the total Nonintercourse Act, of March 1, 1809; and the so-called Macon's Bill Number Two⁷⁶, of May 1, 1810. Of these four acts, the Embargo was the most significant, its two successors marking a progressive weakening of confidence in the efficacy of commerce as a coercive instrument.

The act of March 1, 1809, was, indeed, the rather impotent successor to Jefferson's pet measure, the Embargo. A face-saving device, it was far from comforting to the retiring President; at the same time it testified to the American commercial desperation. Designating Great Britain and France as countries with which the United States would hold no commercial relations, it offered to restore relations with whichever of those nations first withdrew its obnoxious Orders and Decrees (*see* Orders in Council; Napoleon's Decrees). Here was, indeed, a marked recession from the late Embargo, which retained our ship-

ping in home ports, for there was nothing in Nonintercourse to prevent a general European trade in which the offender nations might indirectly benefit.

The attempt to pit the French and English against each other in a rivalry for America's commercial favors was rather an entreaty than a threat. And even this was further weakened by a time limit on the act, limiting enforcement at the outset to the close of the next session of the Congress.

While the Nonintercourse Act prohibited direct commerce, it permitted indirect. Its successor, Macon's Bill Number Two, was even milder. Direct commerce with Great Britain and France was reopened, saving only that restrictions should be renewed against one nation in the event that the other repealed its offending legislation. The restrictive system had been tried and found wanting, the Embargo alone being a true pathmarker on man's despairing road to peace.

How the European powers responded to these successive acts is another story. In the diplomatic duel of which they were a part, Napoleon played probably the shrewder role. At any rate when war supplanted these commercial gestures, the United States was at his side.

[Henry Adams, *History of the United States*, V; H. S. Commager, ed., *Documents of American History*.]

LOUIS MARTIN SEARS

Nonintervention, Policy of. A limited right of intervention in the internal affairs of other states is recognized by most writers on international law, though the tendency has been to question the propriety of such intervention except in cases involving "self-preservation." In practice, most of the larger nations at the beginning of the 20th century asserted a right to use armed force to protect their citizens in foreign countries and to compel the payment of debts and other claims. Latin-American governments, which were frequently the objects of such intervention, found the practice highly objectionable. The Calvo doctrine and the Drago doctrine⁷⁷ were expressions of this feeling. For a considerable period, the Caribbean policy of the United States⁷⁸ was based on the desire to avert intervention by European powers in the more disorderly Latin-American countries, by remedying conditions which were likely to provoke conflict: the so-called Roosevelt corollary to the Monroe Doctrine⁷⁹.

The second Hague Peace Conference⁸⁰ in 1907 adopted a convention stating that:

"The Contracting Powers agree not to have recourse to armed force for the recovery of con-

tractual debts demanded of the government of one country by that of another, as due to its citizens. This undertaking shall not be applicable when the debtor state refuses or leaves unanswered an offer to arbitrate or, in case of acceptance, makes the establishment of a compromise impossible, or, after arbitration, fails to comply with the judgment rendered."

Fear of European intervention nevertheless continued to influence the policy of the United States, and efforts to bring about political and financial stability led the United States itself to intervene in Nicaragua, Haiti and the Dominican Republic⁸¹ during the next twenty years, and to interfere in the internal affairs of other Caribbean countries. Such action however, met with strong opposition from public opinion in the United States and in the Latin-American countries, and the Government of the United States became increasingly reluctant to interfere in Caribbean affairs during the decade of the 1920's. American marines were withdrawn from the Dominican Republic in 1924 and from Nicaragua in 1925, though in the latter country a new intervention almost immediately occurred and American forces were not finally withdrawn until January, 1933. Interference in Haitian affairs was gradually terminated after 1930 and the marine brigade was withdrawn in 1934.

In a speech at a dinner of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation on Dec. 28, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt declared that "The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention." Two days earlier the American delegates to the seventh Pan-American Conference⁸² at Montevideo had signed, with reservations, a Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, Article VIII of which provided "No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another." The eighth Pan-American Conference at Lima⁸³ in 1938 adopted a declaration embodying the same principle.

DANA G. MUNRO

Nonpartisan League, The National (1915-24), an agrarian uprising in the Northwest, aroused one of the most bitter political controversies in recent American history. In immediate origin it was a revolt of the spring wheat farmers against the evils of the grain trade, but in part it was a culmination of the progressive movement⁸⁴ in the Northwest. Marketing unrest, centering in North Dakota, was directed chiefly against the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, which, it was charged, exercised a monopolistic control over the wheat trade. Led by the Equity Co-

operative Exchange after 1908, the farmers of North Dakota attempted to break the hold of the combine by establishing their own terminal facilities. When in 1915 the conservative administration of Gov. L. B. Hanna refused to carry out plans—twice approved by the voters—for a state-owned terminal elevator, the state was ready for revolt.

The man of the hour was A. C. Townley, “busted” flax farmer of western North Dakota and Socialist party^{ss} organizer. In the spring of 1915 Townley, with the assistance of Equity and Socialist party leaders, launched the Nonpartisan League, demanding state-owned elevators, mills, packing plants, etc., state hail insurance, state rural credits and taxation reform. Capitalizing the bitterness aroused by the Equity conflict and directed by men skilled in the art of organizing farmers, the League swept the state. In 1916 a ticket headed by a dirt farmer, Lynn J. Frazier, captured the primaries of the Republican party^{ss}, and was easily elected. In 1918 and 1920 the League was again successful. In 1919 the entire League program was enacted into law. The North Dakota Mill and Elevator and the Bank of North Dakota are still in operation.

After 1916 the League spread into neighboring states, its growth facilitated by a series of poor crops in the spring wheat region. Many progressive leaders, such as Charles A. Lindbergh, Minnesota League candidate for the Republican gubernatorial nomination in 1918, joined the movement, and the organizing genius of Townley, coupled with an effective publicity service, built up a formidable organization. Strong financial resources, which came from high membership fees, enabled the League to carry the fight to its enemies. North Dakota, Minnesota, South Dakota and Montana were most strongly organized, but many members were reported in Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Idaho, Washington and Oregon. In each state the program of the League was modified to take advantage of local conditions, but state ownership of marketing facilities was the principal point in each platform. In states having large industrial populations, League leaders broadened their program to include the demands of the workingman and were generally able to effect a coalition of farmer-labor forces. In no state was the League so successful as in North Dakota. The strategy of the League was to capture the primaries of the dominant party; this was accomplished in several states, but outside North Dakota conservative elements were powerful enough to prevent victory at the general elections. No attempt was made by the

Nonrecognition Policy

League to influence the presidential election of 1920.

The strength of the League began to wane after 1920. The post-World-War depression, severe in the agricultural states by 1921, made difficult the payment of dues, and without money the organization weakened. The nationalistic reaction which followed the war also weakened the movement. During the war the League's advocacy of conscription of wealth had resulted in accusations of disloyalty, and these, combined with the cry of socialism, brought the League into disrepute in many quarters. In North Dakota, influenced by charges of mismanagement of the industrial program and by several banking scandals involving League leaders, the voters recalled Gov. Frazier in 1921. By 1924 the organization had practically disappeared; but the left-wing political revolt which it had created lived on—in Minnesota as the Farmer-Labor party^{ss}, in North Dakota and other states as a faction within existing parties.

[Paul R. Fossum, *The Agrarian Movement in North Dakota*; Herbert E. Gaston, *The Nonpartisan League*.]

ROBERT H. BAHRER

Nonrecognition Policy. There have been two nonrecognition policies of the United States Government. One has been the policy of refusal to recognize revolutionary governments in Latin America. The other, generally referred to as the Stimson Doctrine, is the refusal to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement brought about contrary to the Pact of Paris^{ss}.

The United States policy of refusing to recognize revolutionary governments in Latin America was in full effect from 1913 until about 1930. Woodrow Wilson opposed the recognition of governments brought into being through violence. Recognition was denied to revolutionary governments in Mexico and several Caribbean republics. In 1923, due largely to the influence of the United States, a treaty was signed by the five Central American governments amplifying a previous antirevolutionary convention of 1907. The five republics promised each other not to recognize revolutionary governments as among themselves. In recent years our nonrecognition policy has largely broken down. In 1930 the United States recognized revolutionary governments in several South American countries. The Department of State then declared that the United States policy of nonrecognition was confined to our relations with the governments of Central America and was based on the principle of the treaty of 1923. On Jan. 1, 1934, Costa Rica and Salvador withdrew from the 1923 treaty. The United States policy then remained

technically in effect with regard to but three countries, Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala.

The Stimson Doctrine was set forth by Secretary of State Stimson on Jan. 7, 1932, during the conquest of Manchuria by Japan. In identic notes to Japan and China Secretary Stimson stated that the United States did not intend to recognize any situation, treaty or agreement brought about by means contrary to the Pact of Paris. On March 11, 1932, the Assembly of the League of Nations approved a similar statement. The doctrine prevented any widespread recognition of the state of Manchukuo. The principle of the nonrecognition of conquest, on which the doctrine is based, has been developed in Pan-American conferences²⁷ and discussions.

[B. H. Williams, *American Diplomacy, Policies and Practice*, H. L. Stimson, *The United States and the Other Central American Powers*, *Publications of the Dept. of State*, L. A. Series No. 4, H. L. Stimson, *The Far Eastern Crisis, Recollections and Observations*.]

BENJAMIN H. WILLIAMS

Nonsense, Fort. At the terminal point of a high ridge extending into Morristown, N. J., from the southwest, and overlooking the town, are the remains of a redoubt known as Fort Nonsense. Popular belief has long connected these earthworks with the second encampment of the American army at Morristown²⁸ (1779-80) when Washington, merely to save his men from the demoralizing effects of an inactive camp life, put them to work building a fort never intended for use.

[A. M. Sherman, *Historic Morristown*.]

C. A. TITUS

Nonslaveholders of the Old South. According to the census of 1860 there were 383,637 slaveholders in the fifteen slaveholding states. The white population of these states numbered 8,039,000. Assuming that slaveholders were heads of families, and assuming five persons to the family, it is seen that less than 2,000,000 persons, or less than one out of four white persons, were included in the slaveholding class.

The nonslaveholders fall into two classes. One, far the more numerous, included small farmers, artisans and tradesmen. Members of this class might be industrious and intelligent, and usually expected to rise into the ranks of the slaveholders. Many, born into this class, reached high position in the Old South, numbering such men as Gov. Joseph E. Brown of Georgia, Gov. John Letcher of Virginia, Christopher G. Memminger, Confederate Secretary of the Treasury, and Andrew Johnson, later President of the United States.

Another class of Southern nonslaveholding

whites, whose number it is impossible to estimate, but which was relatively small, has been conventionally designated as "poor whites,"²⁹ or "po' white trash." Such persons were shiftless hangers-on, squatters or tenants, in wilderness or piney-wood³⁰ clearings, or might form squalid communities of their own in barren lands, avoided by whites and Negroes alike.

[U. B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South*.]

HAYWOOD J. PEARCE, JR.

Nonvoting, Extent and Cause of. Because of the lack of data the subject of nonvoting in the United States prior to the Civil War has not been investigated. In the latter half of the 19th century, from about one fifth to one fourth of the estimated eligible voters failed to appear on election day. In the 20th century, the number of nonvoters tended to increase gradually until after the 1924 election. In 1920 and 1924 a bare one half of the estimated electorate came to the polls. The slump in voting interest at this time was in part the result of the indifference of the newly enfranchised women (*see* Nineteenth Amendment). In 1928 the raising of the wet-and-dry issue and the stirring of religious prejudice (*see* Campaign of 1928) increased the level of participation to about three fifths of the electorate. The issues created by the economic depression in the 1930's maintained and increased this level of voting efficiency.

The decline in popular participation in elections during the first three decades of the 20th century was in part the result of the dominant position which the Republican party³¹ occupied during that period. Outside of the Solid South³², the greatest amount of indifference was found in the sure Republican states, such as Pennsylvania and some of the New England states. In those states where the margin between the major parties was fairly close, the participation did not drop below three fourths of the estimated eligible voters.

A number of isolated studies of voting behavior in the United States brought out the fact that nonvoting was related to such factors as high mobility, unskilled occupations, inferior educational attainments, foreign birth and ignorance regarding American political institutions. It has also been shown that the larger the city and the more rapid its growth, the greater has been the number of nonvoters. The citizens living in rural areas have in general shown much more interest in voting than their urban cousins. In all states there has been considerable variation in interest in voting at different elections. The highest vote is usually for President and for the state political

142 Nootka Sound Controversy

officers, whereas the lowest vote is cast for minor administrative officers.

[C. E. Merriam and H. F. Gosnell, *Non-Voting: Causes and Methods of Control*; A. M. Schlesinger and E. M. Eriksson, *The Vanishing Voter*, in *New Republic*, Vol. XL.]

HAROLD F. GOSNELL

Nootka Sound Controversy, THE, arose from conflicting British and Spanish claims to the northwest coast of North America. In 1789 expeditions from both countries arrived to occupy Nootka Sound, on Vancouver Island. The Spaniard seized the Englishman, his associates and vessels, and sent them to Mexico. The viceroy referred the matter to Madrid. The Spanish court demanded that the British court disavow the acts of its commander. The British refused, making counter demands. Each prepared for war and applied to its allies for assurances of support. Britain's responded affirmatively. Spain sought support under the Family Compact⁹⁹. Being in the throes of the French Revolution, France responded tardily and unsatisfactorily; and revolutionary contagion was feared by Spain. By a convention signed Oct. 28, 1790, Spain conceded most British demands. In the Oregon controversy⁹⁹ Britain claimed all she thought she had gained in 1790; and the United States claimed what Spain retained, having acquired Spain's claims in the Florida Purchase Treaty⁹⁹.

[*Annual Report*, Amer. Hist. Assn., 1904.]

WILLIAM R. MANNING

Norfolk, Va., founded in 1682, owed its first growth to the fact that Albemarle and Pamlico sounds are practically land-locked seas, which forced the planters of northeastern North Carolina to bring their products to Norfolk for exportation. In time, when the increasing size of the English tobacco ships made it difficult for them to take on goods as formerly, directly at the plantation wharves, it also became the chief port for the Chesapeake Bay region. Many Scotch merchants who settled at Norfolk established chains of stores upon the rivers of Virginia and Maryland from which they drew tobacco, wheat, corn, naval stores and provisions. The tobacco and wheat were sent to Great Britain in exchange for manufactured goods and the naval stores and provisions to the West Indies for sugar, molasses and rum⁹⁹.

During the Revolution Norfolk was occupied by Lord Dunmore with a mixed force of British, Tories and Negroes. The patriots drove him out, but realizing that the place could not be defended against the British navy, they laid the town in ashes. With the conclusion of peace Norfolk was

Norridgewock Fight

rebuilt. During the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars it enjoyed great prosperity, but it declined after the Treaty of Ghent⁹⁹ because of restrictions on the carrying trade to the British West Indies. Its growth was retarded, also, by the rivalry of Baltimore and New York, by its failure to secure railway connection with the interior of Virginia, by the yellow-fever epidemic of 1855 and by the Civil War and Reconstruction.

When Virginia seceded the Federals destroyed part of the navy yard at Norfolk and the Confederates completed the work when they abandoned the city in 1862. After the Civil War termini were established at Norfolk for one important railway system after another until the port became one of the nation's chief points of export for coal, cotton and tobacco. Norfolk, with its metropolitan area around Hampton Roads, constitutes the greatest center of population in the Atlantic states south of the Potomac.

[T. J. Wertenbaker, *Norfolk: Historic Southern Port*.]

THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER

Normal and Teacher Training Schools. See Teachers Colleges.

"Normalcy." In an address before the Home Market Club at Boston, May 14, 1920, Sen. Warren G. Harding said, in part, "America's present need is not heroics but healing, not nostrums but normalcy. . . ." The word normalcy came quickly to symbolize to many powerful American economic interests the immediate abandonment of the chief foreign and domestic policies of the Wilson administrations. Specifically, it signified a return to high protection, a drastic reduction in income and inheritance taxes, "putting labor in its place," a restoration of subsidies and bounties to favored corporate groups, no government interference in private enterprise, and a vigorous, nationalistic foreign policy. The "back to normal" slogan was used with great effectiveness by the Republicans in the campaign of 1920⁹⁹.

[C. A. and M. R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*.]

THOMAS S. BARCLAY

Norridgewock Fight, THE (Aug. 12 O.S., 1724), at present Madison, Maine, was the crucial point of Dummer's War⁹⁹. Capt. Jeremiah Moulton, of Harmon's expeditionary force, with about eighty men, invested the stockaded Indian town, full of warriors from several tribes assembled for raids on English settlements, and got within pistol shot of the unguarded gates before being discovered. The Indians rallied, fired two ineffective volleys, then ran to Kennebec River, where

they were slaughtered in crossing. Between 80 and 100 Indians, including seven noted chiefs and Father Rasles, their missionary, were killed. The town was burned. The English loss was two soldiers wounded and a Mohawk killed.

[F. H. Eckstorm, *The Fight at Norridgewock*, *New England Quarterly*, Vol VII, Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts*, J. P. Baxter, *Pioneers of New France in New England*.]

FANNIE HARDY ECKSTORM

Norris Dam, named for Sen George W. Norris, located on the Clinch River, twenty miles northwest of Knoxville, Tenn., was built by the Tennessee Valley Authority[™], and finished in 1936. The dam meets a threefold purpose: navigation, flood control and electric-power production. It impounds water during the wet season in a 153,000-acre reservoir. Power is generated during the dry season when impounded water is released. Norris Dam is of concrete construction, 1800 feet long at crest, 204 feet thick at base and 265 feet high.

[B. M. Jones, Norris Dam, *Scientific American*, January, 1935, *Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority*, June 30, 1936.]

ALLEN E. RAGAN

Norris Farm Export Act, THE, often called the McNary Act, was introduced May 31, 1921, by Sen Norris. After a stormy legislative history it was approved Aug. 24, 1921. In form, it is an amendment to the War Finance Corporation Act[™]. The Corporation was authorized to make advances up to \$1,000,000,000 to finance agricultural exports

[L. B. Shippee, *Recent American History*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Law, THE (1932), was a legislative attempt to circumvent Supreme Court limitations upon the activities of organized labor groups, especially as these limitations were imposed between enactment of the Clayton Law[™] in 1914 and the end of the 1920's. Based upon the theory that the lower courts are creations not of the Constitution but of Congress, and that therefore Congress has wide power in defining and restricting their jurisdiction, the act forbids issuance of injunctions[™] to sustain antiunion contracts of employment, to prevent ceasing or refusing to perform any work or remain in any relation of employment, or to restrain acts generally constituting component parts of strikes, boycotts and picketing[™].

ROYAL E. MONTGOMERY

Norsemen in America. In the 9th century the Norsemen discovered the Faroes and Iceland,

and sighted the east coast of Greenland (Gunnbjarnarsker). In 982 Erik the Red, exiled from Iceland, discovered Greenland explored its west coast and founded a colony of Icelanders there in 986 which existed for five centuries, but its ultimate fate is still unknown. The *Tale of the Greenlanders* tells of Bjarni Herjólfsson seeing in 986 three lands which by some are supposed to have been the American continent. The story, however, is doubtful, as is the account in the same source of five successive expeditions to Vinland[™]. The *Saga of Erik the Red* appears to be more reliable. According to it Leif Eriksson, on his voyage from Norway to Greenland, accidentally discovered, in the year 1000, Vinland, a country where wild grapes and "self-sown" wheat grew. An expedition of exploration and attempted colonization of the newly discovered land followed in 1005, led by Thorfinn Karlsefni, an Icelander, with three ships and 160 men. They first came upon a land they called Helluland, then another they called Markland, thereupon they sailed by long, sandy and desolate beaches they called Furdustrands, and settled for the winter in Straumfjord, an attractive place in summer, but with a severe winter climate. Next summer one of the ships returned home while the others proceeded southward and came to a place they called Hóp, where wild grapes and "self-sown" wheat were to be found. One winter was spent there, but the settlement had to be abandoned because of the hostility of the aborigines, the Skraelings. Karlsefni returned to Straumfjord and spent there the third winter, returning in the summer of 1007 to Greenland. There were no more expeditions, but the Greenlanders apparently kept up the connection with Markland long afterward, probably for securing timber.

No Norse remains have so far been found on the American continent, hence any identification of the places mentioned in the sources is difficult, if not impossible. Helluland is generally supposed to be northern Labrador, Markland farther south on the Labrador coast, Furdustrands, the south coast of Labrador, and Straumfjord possibly Chaleur Bay. If the story about the wild grapes is authentic, Vinland and Hóp must be sought somewhere on the coast of New England south of Passamaquoddy Bay, the northern limits of wild grapes.

It has not been proved that these voyages influenced in any way the discoverers of America in the 15th century.

[A. M. Reeves, *The Finding of Vineland the Good*; J. E. Olson and E. G. Bourne, eds., *The Northmen, Columbus and Cabot*, H. Hermannsson, *The Problem of Vineland*; G. M. Gathorne-Hardy, *The Norse Discoverers of Amer-*

ica; W. Hovgaard, *The Voyages of the Norsemen to America*; W. H. Babcock, *Early Norse Visits to North America*; P. Nörlund, *Viking Settlers in Greenland and Their Descendants during Five Hundred Years.*]

HALLDÓR HERMANNSON

North American Land Company, THE, was organized in Philadelphia (1795) by Robert Morris, John Nicholson and James Greenleaf to develop and sell 6,000,000 acres in Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Kentucky. Capital stock was \$3,000,000, divided into 30,000 shares at \$100 each. Repeated attempts to sell stock failed because of financial stress here and abroad, unsettled European conditions, and the unpopularity of stock companies. Greenleaf's nefarious land operations cost Morris £30,000; the Bank of England suspended specie payments; Morris' notes were foreclosed, and all contributed to the company's decline. In April, 1797, Morris threw the remaining lands into the Pennsylvania Property Company in a last futile attempt to recoup a fortune.

[E. P. Oberholtzer, *Robert Morris.*]

JULIAN P. BOYD

North Anna, Battle of (May 23-25, 1864). Failing to break Lee's (C.) lines at Spotsylvania^{va}, Grant (U) moved toward Hanover Courthouse, May 20. Lee, outmarching him, fortified behind the North Anna River at Hanover Junction, covering Richmond. Arriving there May 23, Grant's army in sharp fighting forced the river crossings and entrenched. But finding Lee's position too strong to warrant a general assault, Grant on May 26 moved by his left toward the Pamunkey at Hanover Town.

[O. L. Spaulding, *The United States Army.*]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

North Carolina. In 1585 the first English colony in America was planted on Roanoke Island, with Ralph Lane as governor and Walter Raleigh^{nc} as promoter. This colony failed, as did another colony sent out in 1587, with John White as governor. In 1629 Charles I granted "Carolina" to Sir Robert Heath^{nc}, who failed to plant a colony. About 1650 settlers from Virginia began to locate along the Albemarle^{nc} Sound, and in 1663 Charles II granted Carolina to eight Lords Proprietors (*see* Carolina Proprietors). A second charter, in 1665, fixed the boundaries of Carolina at 36 degrees and 30 minutes on the north, 29 degrees on the south, and westward to the Pacific Ocean. In 1664 the Proprietors created two "counties" in what is now North Carolina—Albemarle and Clarendon (Cape Fear

North Carolina

region), and offered land grants, tax exemption and other inducements to settlers. Clarendon was soon abandoned, and it was half a century before the Cape Fear^{nc} country was settled. Until 1691 Albemarle had a proprietary governor and an elective legislature. From that date to 1711, North Carolina, as the northern portion of Carolina came to be called, was ruled by a deputy governor from Charles Town, although it had its own legislature. In 1712 an independent governor was appointed for North Carolina. In 1729 it became a royal colony^{nc}.

North Carolina grew slowly during the proprietary period because of its dangerous coast and other geographical handicaps; neglect of the Proprietors; weakness and inefficiency of its governors; Indian wars; piracy, friction over the Established Church; uncertainty of land titles and unpopularity of quitrents^{nc} and the greater attractiveness of other colonies. Only five towns were founded during this period—Bath (1705), New Bern (1710), and Edenton, Beaufort and Brunswick.

From 1729 to 1775, government improved, population increased and spread, agriculture and industry developed, many churches and a few academies were established, and three newspapers began publication. The lower Cape Fear was settled about 1725, and the upper Cape Fear after 1740. During the next thirty years thousands of Scotch-Irish and Germans moved from Pennsylvania into the Piedmont^{nc}, and by 1775 settlements had reached the mountains.

North Carolina patriots openly resisted the Stamp Act; organized nonimportation associations to boycott British goods, called a meeting in defiance of the governor and chose delegates to the Continental Congress; set up a temporary government in 1775; crushed the Tories at Moore's Creek Bridge^{nc}, Feb. 27, 1776; and, at Halifax, April 12, 1776, authorized their delegates in the Continental Congress to vote for independence—the first state to take such action. Guilford Courthouse^{nc} was about the only important Revolutionary battle in the state, but North Carolina troops fought valiantly in other states, and also conquered the Cherokees^{nc} in the West. The state's first constitution was drafted in 1776, and set up a government characterized by a weak executive, property and religious qualification for voting and officeholding, and a bicameral legislature elected annually.

The chief problems confronting the new state were: lack of specie and depreciation of paper currency; backwardness of agriculture, industry, commerce and education; Tories and their property; transmontane lands, and relations with the

central government. The state ceded its western lands in 1790, and Tennessee⁹⁹ was created therefrom. North Carolina rejected the Federal Constitution⁹⁹ in 1788, but ratified in 1789, thus being next to the last state to accept that document. The state was Federalist for less than a decade, and has been Democratic since 1800, with the exception of the years of Whig supremacy, 1840-52, the Reconstruction era and the "fusion" period, 1896-1900.

Prior to 1840 North Carolina was one of the most backward states in the Union. This was due to unscientific farming and soil exhaustion, lack of manufactures and adequate transportation facilities, commercial dependence on Virginia and South Carolina, emigration and a planter-controlled government, which was unwilling to spend money for internal improvements⁹⁹ and education. The state constitution was revised in 1835 and a more democratic government was created, with the western part of the state having predominant influence. The Whigs⁹⁹, championing internal improvements, rose to power and the state enjoyed two decades of progress, under Whig rule in the 1840's and under the Democrats⁹⁹ in the 1850's. Railroads and plank roads were constructed; cotton mills and other industries were established, a public-school system was begun and many other progressive measures were adopted.

Though North Carolina held over 300,000 slaves in 1860, Union sentiment was strong, and it was not until May 20, 1861, that the state seceded, after Lincoln had called on it for troops for the Federal Army. It contributed about 125,000 men to the Southern cause; sustained about one fourth of the Confederate losses; fed and clothed its own soldiers; led all the states in blockade-running⁹⁹; and probably received less Confederate patronage than any Southern state. Battles were fought at Plymouth, New Bern, Fort Fisher, Bentonville⁹⁹, and other places, and "the last surrender of the Civil War," that of Joseph E. Johnston to William T. Sherman, occurred at the Bennett House, near Durham.

North Carolina was almost prostrate at the close of the war, though it did not suffer as much as some of the Southern states (*see* Reconstruction). It was readmitted to the Union in 1868, after it had ratified the Fourteenth Amendment⁹⁹, and had drafted a new state constitution. Some of the most significant changes made by this document were: the popular election of all state and county officials, the adoption of the township-county commission form of government, and provision for a "general and uniform system of public schools." With the return of home rule⁹⁹,

thirty amendments were added to the constitution (1875-76). Secret political societies were made illegal, white and black schools were to be kept separate; marriages between whites and blacks were forbidden; residence requirements for voting were raised (*see* Fifteenth Amendment), and the legislature was given virtual control over county government. Only a few constitutional amendments have been added since 1876.

After the Civil War, farm tenancy⁹⁹ replaced the old plantation economy and tended to increase to such an extent that today it is one of the state's greatest social and economic problems. Tobacco⁹⁹ and furniture manufacturing became major industries, the textile industry⁹⁹ expanded and railroad construction was revived. As late as 1900, however, North Carolina was still one of the most backward states. Transportation facilities were inadequate, the state ranked near the bottom in education, and the farmers were poverty-stricken as a result of low prices for their crops, high prices for what they purchased and excessive interest and freight rates.

Since 1900 the state has made phenomenal progress. It has become one of the leading agricultural states of the nation, ranking first in tobacco production, and having high rank in many other crops, as well as in per-acre yields. It leads all the states in tobacco and cotton textile manufacturing, and ranks first in the South in furniture production. It was the pioneer state of the South in good road construction. It still ranks low in secondary education, though within a twenty-year period the length of its public-school term increased from four to eight months. Its institutions of higher learning compare favorably with the leading ones of the country. And it has received nationwide recognition for its work in public health.

[R. D. W. Connor, *North Carolina: Rebuilding an Ancient Commonwealth*; Hugh T. Lefler, ed., *North Carolina History Told by Contemporaries*.]

HUGH T. LEFLER

North Carolina, Governor of, to Governor of South Carolina. "It's a damn long time between drinks," said Edward B. Dudley, governor of North Carolina, to Pierce Mason Butler, chief executive of South Carolina, in 1838, at the home of Mrs. Nancy Anne Jones, about midway between Raleigh and Durham, N. C. About five years later, at a meeting on the state line, not far from Charlotte, Gov. J. M. Morehead said to Gov. J. H. Hammond of South Carolina, "It's a damned long time between drinks."

[Raleigh (N. C.) *News and Observer*, March 13, 1938.]

HUGH T. LEFLER

146 North Carolina Railroad

North Carolina Railroad, THE, was built, 1848-56, by the State of North Carolina from Goldsboro to Charlotte, by way of Greensboro, Salisbury and Concord, 232 miles, and considered "the greatest internal improvement ever undertaken by the state." It connected with several roads already constructed in eastern North Carolina and gave the state its first east-west rail connection. Three fourths of the stock, originally valued at \$3,000,000, is owned by the state. In 1871 the road was leased to the Richmond and Danville Company, and in 1895 to the Southern Railway Companysm for a term of ninety-nine years.

[C. K. Brown, *A State Movement in Railroad Development*.]
HUGH T. LEFLER

North Church, Boston, whose real name is Christ Church, was erected in 1723, the second Episcopal Church to be established in Boston, and in 1939 was the oldest church edifice in the city. Probably the first peal of bells used in this country—cast in England in 1744—is in its tower. It was in the steeple of this church that the signal lights were hung for Paul Revere's guidance on the night of April 18, 1775 (*see* Revere's Ride).

[Justin Winsor, *Memorial History of Boston*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

North Dakota was formed by a division of the territory of Dakotasm in 1889. The enabling act was passed by Congress on Feb. 22, 1889; the state constitution was adopted by popular vote the same year and President Harrison issued the proclamation of statehood on Nov. 2, 1889. The state has an area of 70,837 square miles with a population of 706,000, and is divided into fifty-three counties. The capital is located at Bismarck, which was made the territorial capital in 1883. The state flower is the prairie rose. Physiographically the state is divided into two great drainage basins, the Missouri and the Red River.

The interests of education are served by the institutions of higher learning and a well balanced system of public schools. The state university made a unique contribution in its constitution (1916) which preserves its academic freedom and neutralizes the influences of local politics.

The main lines of three great railways pass across the state, the Northern Pacific, the Great Northernsm and the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault Ste. Marie. The state is also served by branches from two other railways, the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul and the Chicago and North Westernsm.

The southern portion of the International

North West Company

Peace Gardensm is located in the Turtle Mountain area and is being developed as a part of the state park system.

Industrially the state depends at present on its agricultural resources, which are produced largely in the drainage basin of the Red River. Its cereals in order of importance are spring wheat, corn, flax, oats, barley and rye. The forage crops are important, alfalfa and sweet clover being the most important. The state is well known for the high quality of its potato crop and for the value of the sugar beets grown here. Livestock and dairy products are increasingly valuable sources of revenue for that part of the state west of the Red River Valley.

The lignite coal beds are 35,000 square miles in extent and can furnish unlimited power for future industrial plants. The more important by-products of lignite are illuminating gas, dyes, fuel oil and a great variety of lubricants. The clay beds are extensive and of the finest quality and give ample promise for future developments in the production of pottery, porcelains, brick and allied products.

In national politics the state has always maintained its support of the Republican party except for the four presidential elections of 1892, 1912, 1916 and 1936. It gave enthusiastic support to the progressive movementssm of Theodore Roosevelt and LaFollette. In state politics it has been quite consistently Republican. The victory of the progressive wing of that party in 1906 and the appearance of the Nonpartisan Leaguesm in 1916 have served to accentuate the differences between the liberal and conservative wings of the Republican party. The important pure food state legislation introduced by E. F. Ladd of the Agricultural College (and later United States senator) antedates similar national legislation of 1906.

The laws providing for the Bank of North Dakota and the State Mill and Elevator represent some of the typical reform measures promoted by the Nonpartisan League.

[H. C. Fish and R. M. Black, *A Brief History of North Dakota; North Dakota Blue Book*, 1919.]

O. G. LIBBY

North West Company, THE, was never an incorporated company like its chief rivals, the Hudson's Bay Company and the American Fur Companysm. It might be said rather to resemble more closely a modern holding company, the constituent parts of which were chiefly Montreal firms and partnerships engaged in the fur trade. It came into existence during the period of the American Revolution and ended by coalescing with the Hudson's Bay Company in 1821. In the

interim it had reorganized in 1783, added the firm of Gregory, McLeod & Company, its chief rival in 1787, split into two factions in the later 1790's, reunited in 1804, joined forces with the American Fur Company, temporarily in 1811, been ejected from effective work on the soil of the United States (1816), and established its posts over much of Canada and northern United States. Its main line of communication was the difficult canoe route from Montreal, up the Ottawa River, through Lakes Huron and Superior, to its chief inland depot (Grand Portage^{re} before 1804, Fort William thereafter). Beyond Lake Superior the route to the Pacific was the international boundary waters to Lake of the Woods, the Winnipeg River, the Saskatchewan River, the Peace River and the Fraser River. Many lines branched from this main one, south into the Wisconsin, Dakota, Minnesota and Oregon countries, north to Lake Athabasca and the Mackenzie River area. Attempts were made by the company, but unavailingly, to get access to the interior through Hudson Bay, whose basin was the exclusive trading area of the Hudson's Bay Company. It was only when excessive competition between the two companies, raised to fever pitch after the Earl of Selkirk established his colony in the Red River Valley^{re} in 1811, had led to actual warfare that the North West Company got its cheaper transportation route, and then only at the cost of sinking its individuality under the charter rights and acquiring the name of the Hudson's Bay Company. When this union came in 1821 the Scotch, Yankee, English and French-Canadian employees of the North West Company had had nearly fifty years of valorous exploration and trail blazing; they had forced the Hudson's Bay Company to build forts in the interior; they had developed the *voyageur*^{re} to the acme of his unique serviceability; they had discovered the way to maintain a canoe route to the Pacific, through the use of pemmican^{re}, a concentrate of buffalo meat and grease; and they had contributed an *éclat* to the fur trade that gives it a charm forever in American and Canadian annals.

[Gordon C. Davidson, *The North West Company*; Douglas MacKay, *The Honourable Company*; W. Stewart Wallace, ed., *Documents Relating to the North West Company*.]

GRACE LEE NUTE

Northeast Boundary (1783-1842) The Definitive Treaty of Peace of 1783^{re} designated the northeastern boundary as the St. Croix to its source, thence a line due north to the highlands dividing the rivers tributary to the St. Lawrence from those tributary to the Atlantic, thence along

the highlands to the most northwestern head of the Connecticut, down the latter to the parallel of 45° and thence on 45° to the St. Lawrence (*see* Red Line Map) The controversy concerning the identity of the true St. Croix was settled in 1798 by a mixed commission selected under a provision of the Jay Treaty^{re}. Unsuccessful attempts to decide upon the line of the highlands were made in 1803 and 1807 by the negotiation of draft treaties which were never ratified. Another attempt was made by a provision of the Treaty of Ghent^{re} (1814), resulting in the appointment of a joint mixed commission of two representatives which, after working on the problem for six years (1816-22), by examination of costly joint frontier surveys and acrimonious arguments, reached no agreement except an agreement to disagree and adjourned without resorting to the provision for selection of a friendly umpire.

Under a treaty of 1827, the question of the location of highlands and the ratification of the old survey of 1774 west of the Connecticut was submitted for arbitration by the King of the Netherlands who, in 1831, proposed a compromise line along the upper St. John and the St. Francis tributary and westward to the line claimed by the United States (*see* Netherlands Award) This proposal, not contemplated in the terms of the arbitration, the American Government after some delay declined to accept.

Confronted by new border controversies and irritations, resulting from the advance of settlements in part of the disputed territory, President Jackson suggested a renewal of diplomatic efforts, which were delayed for various reasons. The negotiations were continued with a tone which became more and more acrid until it impressed upon both contesting parties the necessity of a peaceful compromise to prevent border conflict in territory where each party had agreed to refrain from any extension of jurisdiction during the period of the negotiations for peaceful adjustment. From the devious negotiations and increasing danger finally emerged a friendlier attitude which in 1842 found practical expression in the Webster-Ashburton Treaty^{re}.

Early in 1838 Secretary of State Forsyth contemplated the expediency of an attempt at direct negotiations for the establishment of a conventional line, but he obtained no encouragement from Massachusetts, while Maine, early in 1839, precipitated the border clash known as the Aroostook war^{re}. Meanwhile the situation was complicated by unsettled questions concerning the British destruction of the *Caroline*^{re} on the Niagara River. (*See also* McLeod Case.)

In 1841 Webster, who succeeded Forsyth, determined to end the long dispute by conciliatory compromise. After declining Palmerston's proposal for arbitration by a commission of three European kings he stated his decision to attempt a settlement on the basis of a conventional line, resulting in the British decision to appoint Lord Ashburton as a special minister to conduct the negotiations at Washington. Webster tactfully prepared the way for the co-operation of Maine and Massachusetts.

The negotiators finally were successful in reaching an agreement to accept as the boundary the upper St. John to the St. Francis, the latter to Lake Pohenagamoot, thence a direct southwest line to a point near the southwest branch of the St. John, thence a line via the crest of the hills to the northwest branch (Hall's Stream) of the Connecticut River and west of the Connecticut on the old survey line of the parallel of 45° to the St. Lawrence. These agreements, and provisions for certain equivalents for loss of American territory in Maine, and other incidental agreements, were included in the famous Webster-Ashburton Treaty which was signed at Washington on Aug. 9, 1842.

[J. M. Callahan, *American Foreign Policy in Canadian Relations*; J. B. Moore, *International Arbitrations*, Vol. I.]
J. M. CALLAHAN

Northern Mine Barrage, THE (1918), was a mine field 230 miles long and from fifteen to thirty-five miles wide which was laid between the Orkneys and Norway to blockade German submarines. The mine, invented by R. C. Browne, of Salem, Mass., and perfected by S. P. Fullinwider and T. S. Wilkinson, Jr., of the United States Navy, could be placed as deep as 240 feet below the surface. It also had a long wire antenna which would explode the contents, 300 lbs. of T.N.T., on contact with any metallic object.

The various parts were manufactured in different American factories, shipped to the west coast of Scotland, transported to Invergordon or Inverness on the east coast, and there assembled. From there mine layers, protected by screens of destroyers, cruisers and battleships, planted the mines until 70,263 had been used, 56,611 by the United States and the rest by the British. On one occasion over 5000 were dropped within four hours. After a few disastrous attempts on March 3, 1918, in which 43% of the mines planted were lost in the operation, the real work began on June 8 and continued until Oct. 24.

From the day the work began, German U-boats were damaged or destroyed. The exact number is unknown but is estimated at sixteen. The moral effect was perhaps greater in shattering

the morale of submarine crews and thus helping to produce the revolt of German seamen which marked the beginning of the defeat of Germany.

[*The Northern Mine Barrage and Other Mining Activities*, Compiled by the Historical Section, Navy Department, 1919.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Northern Pacific Railroad, THE, chartered in 1864, received a land grant of 44,000,000 acres (see Land Grants to Railways). The road was to run from the head of Lake Superior to the Pacific coast. In 1869 Jay Cooke^{qv} became financial agent. Construction was started in 1870. By 1873 the road had reached Bismarck, N. D., and Jay Cooke had reached the end of his resources. His failure, Sept. 18, 1873, set off the Panic of 1873^{qv}. The railroad defaulted in 1875 and was foreclosed in 1876. Henry Villard, through the purchase of the Oregon Steam Navigation Company, got control of the road. Connection was made with the Oregon road in 1883, and in 1887 the line was completed to Seattle. In 1901 the fight for control by Harriman and Hill sent the stock of the Northern Pacific to \$1000. Neither side won and they agreed to form the Northern Securities Company to hold the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern and the Burlington^{qv}. In 1904 this move was held to be a violation of the Sherman Antitrust Law^{qv}.

[H. U. Faulkner, *American Economic History*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Northern Securities Case, THE (193 U. S. 197, 1904), started out as a rather ordinary contest between competitive railroad trunk lines over control of an intermediate "feeder" line and ended up as a struggle for supremacy between the Morgan and James J. Hill group on one side and Edward H. Harriman and affiliated financial interests on the other. The former controlled the Northern Pacific and Great Northern^{qv} railways. The latter controlled the Union Pacific System^{qv}. The immediate occasion of the rivalry was an effort by Harriman to wrest from Morgan and Hill a special interest in the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy^{qv}, thereby effecting an entrance into Chicago.

When Harriman had contrived to acquire, at first by stealthy moves and then by frenzied bidding culminating in the "Northern Pacific Panic" of 1901, a sufficient interest to give him a majority of the voting rights outstanding in Northern Pacific stock, he was checkmated by Morgan's threat to call for redemption the preferred stock, which represented a large part of Harriman's holdings. Negotiations ensued for a friendly settlement out of which emerged the Northern Se-

Northfield Bank Robbery

curities Company This was a holding company which took over all of the contestants' stock interests in the Great Northern, Northern Pacific and Burlington lines, and in this company the Morgan and Hill group held a controlling interest.

Challenged as a violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act⁷⁰ the defendants contended that that act did not embrace, and that if it were held to embrace it was beyond the constitutional power of Congress to regulate, *a fortiori* to prohibit, the mere transfer of proprietary interests in any enterprise from one person to another. It was especially urged that if, as in this case, the purchasing party was a corporation duly organized by a sovereign state and expressly authorized to make the acquisitions here attacked, the application of the Sherman Act's prohibitions would invade powers constitutionally reserved to the states.

The decision of the Supreme Court upheld the Government's contention that the holding company had been used as an illegal device for restraining trade, since its necessary effect was to eliminate competition in transportation service over a large section of the country.

[H. R. Seager and C. Gulick, *Trust and Corporation Problems*; A. D. Noyes, *The Northern Securities Decision*, 35 *Forum* 39, 1904, J. C. Gray, *The Merger Case*, 17 *Harvard Law Review* 474, 1904.]

MYRON W. WATKINS

Northfield Bank Robbery (Sept. 7, 1876). After some days of preliminary scouting, eight men, probably including Frank and Jesse James, and headed by Thomas "Cole" Younger a former Quantrill guerrilla, rode into Northfield, Minn., about noon Sept. 7, 1876. While three men attempted to hold up the First National Bank and killed teller Joseph Heywood, the remainder engaged in a wild gun battle with citizens, during which two bandits were killed and a bystander mortally wounded. Sept. 21 posses surrounded four of the gang near Madelia—two having escaped—and after sharp firing in which one bandit was killed, the three Younger brothers, badly wounded, surrendered.

[Thomas C. Younger, *The Story of Cole Younger*; John J. Lemon, *The Northfield Tragedy*.]

WILLOUGHBY M. BABCOCK

Northmen, THE. See Norsemen in America.

Northwest Angle, THE, is a projection of land extending north of the 49th parallel at the Lake of the Woods⁷¹ on the northern boundary of Minnesota. This area of about 150 square miles, separated from the rest of Minnesota by the southwest bay of the Lake of the Woods, is the

Northwest Boundary Controversy 149

northernmost territory in the United States proper. Ignorance of the geography of the region in 1783, when the Definitive Treaty of Peace⁷² was negotiated, resulted in this curious projection of the international boundary. The treaty provided that the northern boundary of the United States should extend due west from the northwest point of the Lake of the Woods to the Mississippi River. After explorers proved that the source of the Mississippi was not due west, but considerably south of the lake, a proposal that the boundary should be drawn from the northwest point of the lake south to the 49th parallel was adopted in the Convention of 1818⁷³. The Northwest Angle Inlet was designated as the northwest point of the lake in negotiations conducted in 1824, 1825 and 1842. Surveys of the boundary in this vicinity and decisions relating to it have continued over a long period of years; the most recent of the treaties defining it was made in 1925.

[*Final Report of the International Joint Commission on the Lake of the Woods Reference*, 1917, International Boundary Commission, *Joint Report upon the Survey and Demarcation of the Boundary between the United States and Canada from the Northwesternmost Point of Lake of the Woods to Lake Superior*, 1931.]

T. C. BLEGEN

Northwest Boundary Controversy. The Definitive Treaty of Peace of 1783⁷⁴ with Great Britain provided (Article 2d) that the boundary between the United States and British North America should proceed by various streams from the western head of Lake Superior to "the most Northwestern point" of the Lake of the Woods⁷⁵, "and from thence on a due west course to the Mississippi River." The negotiators had before them Mitchell's Map⁷⁶ of North America of 1755, which shows the Mississippi flowing out from under an insert map of Hudson Bay which had been set into the northwest corner of the Mitchell. They assumed that the river rose north of a line due west from the northwesternmost point of the Lake of the Woods. Actually, the source of the river is 152 miles south of that latitude. Thus a serious boundary gap was left by the peace settlement. It first became a matter of dispute in 1792 when Great Britain unsuccessfully proposed to close it by a boundary rectification which would have extended British territory south to the navigable waters of the Mississippi, thus giving Canada an access to that river, the free navigation of which had been guaranteed by the treaty of peace to the citizens and subjects of both parties. Jay's Treaty⁷⁷ of 1794 established a mixed commission to determine the northwestern boundary, but it never met. In 1803 Rufus King signed a convention to

close the gap by drawing a line from the Lake of the Woods to the source of the Mississippi River, but the Senate did not ratify it for fear of prejudicing the northern boundary of Louisiana⁹⁰ just acquired from France. In 1807 the United States proposed drawing a line north or south from the northwestern corner of the Lake of the Woods to 49° N. Lat. and thence west along that parallel. The British negotiators accepted this, provided the words were added "as far [along the line of 49°] as the territories of the United States extend in that quarter." James Monroe and William Pinkney, the American negotiators, rejected this phraseology because it implied a limitation of American territory anywhere along that line. During the negotiations for peace at Ghent⁹¹ in 1814 the British negotiators reverted to the project of setting up between the Ohio, Mississippi and Great Lakes a "neutral Indian barrier state"⁹²—a proposal first introduced in 1792—and when this fell to the ground they eluded discussion of the boundary west of the Lake of the Woods lest they might recognize the American title to Louisiana which they desired to annul. The peace treaty provided for mutual restoration of occupied territory without stipulating boundaries.

After the Napoleonic wars Great Britain's need for repose caused her to cease contesting the American title to Louisiana, and the northwestern boundary gap disappeared in the Convention of 1818⁹³, which provided that the boundary should proceed from the northwesternmost corner of the Lake of the Woods to 49° N. Lat. and along that degree of latitude to the Rocky Mountains. Beyond the mountains the western territory and rivers claimed by either party were to be free and open for a term of ten years (extended indefinitely in 1826) to the vessels, citizens and subjects of both parties to the treaty without prejudice to the claims of either. The Northwest boundary controversy thus graduated from the closed Northwest boundary gap to the Oregon Question terminated in the Oregon Treaty of 1846⁹⁴ by extending the line of 49° N. Lat. through to the Pacific Ocean.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Jay's Treaty and the Northwest Boundary Gap*, in *The American Historical Review*, XXVII, and *A Diplomatic History of the United States*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Northwest Conspiracy, THE (1864). Military reverses led to a Confederate effort to promote insurrection in the Northwest. Using the Sons of Liberty⁹⁵ and other disaffected elements, it was planned to liberate Confederate prisoners at camps Douglas and Chase⁹⁶ (Chicago and Co-

lumbus) and other prison camps, arm them from seized Federal arsenals and, with the aid of the Sons of Liberty, overthrow the governments of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Missouri. A Northwestern Confederacy, allied with the Confederate States, would be formed. Peace terms would be dictated to a dismembered North.

C. L. Vallandigham, Supreme Commander of the Sons of Liberty, then in Canada, refused to co-operate with Jacob Thompson, Confederate commissioner in Canada. Other less scrupulous Copperhead⁹⁷ leaders accepted funds and promised co-operation. An uprising planned for July 20 was postponed to Aug. 16, and again to Aug. 29, the date of the Democratic National Convention at Chicago. The Federal Government learned of the plan, re-enforced the guard at Camp Douglas where the first blow was to be struck, and the uprising did not take place, although sixty Confederates under Capt. T. H. Hines were present in Chicago.

Abandoning hope of Copperhead assistance, the Confederates proceeded in September and October to create diversions on the Canadian border, most important of which were Beall's raid to liberate prisoners on Johnson's Island and the St. Albans raid⁹⁸.

The Northwest Conspiracy failed because Peace Democrats (or Copperheads) refused to take arms against the Federal Government and because Copperhead violence would endanger Democratic prospects in the campaign of 1864.

[E. J. Benton, *The Movement for Peace without a Victory during the Civil War*.]

CHARLES H. COLEMAN

Northwest Ordinances. See Ordinances of 1784, 1785 and 1787, The; Northwest Territory, The.

Northwest Passage. The search for an all-water route around the northern coast of North America began at the end of the 15th century and lasted 400 years. It may be divided roughly into two periods: (1497-1800) expeditions sent out to find a route to Asia for purposes of trade; (1800-1906) expeditions sent out for the purpose of acquiring geographical knowledge. It is impossible to mention all the numerous voyages, but the following are the most important.

1497-1800. John Cabot (1497-98) explored the American coast from Labrador to Florida. Jacques Cartier (1534-35) discovered the St. Lawrence River and explored it as far as the site of modern Montreal. Martin Frobisher (1576) discovered Frobisher Sound in Baffin Land and entered Hudson Strait. John Davis (1585-86) made three voyages to Davis Strait. Henry Hub-

son (1610) discovered Hudson Bay. William Baffin (1616) thoroughly examined the coast of Baffin Bay and pronounced the bay to be landlocked, a decision that discouraged further exploration in this direction for 200 years. Luke Foxe (1631) explored Fox Channel north of Hudson Bay. In the first half of the 18th century the Hudson's Bay Company sent out several expeditions to search for a passage along the western coast of the bay.

1800-1906. After the Napoleonic wars there began a series of voyages by British naval officers under the supervision of John Barrow, second secretary of the Admiralty. W. E. Parry (first voyage, 1819-20) penetrated from Baffin Bay through Lancaster Sound to McClure Strait; (second voyage, 1821-23) went through Hudson Strait to Fury and Hecla Strait. John Franklin and John Richardson (1819-27) made two overland expeditions to the Arctic Ocean and ranged its coastline from Point Turnagain westward to longitude 148° 42'. John Ross (1829-33) sailed well into Prince Regent Inlet and crossed Boothia Isthmus to discover Victoria Strait. John Franklin (1845-47) sailed through Lancaster Sound, down Peel Sound, to Victoria Strait, where he perished. R. J. L. M. McClure (1850-54) was sent out to find Franklin. He sailed around South America to Bering Strait and thence to McClure Strait where he abandoned his ship. Marching eastward over the ice he joined Belcher's expedition coming from Baffin Bay. He was the first to find an all-water route from ocean to ocean, though heavy ice rendered it unnavigable. Roald Amundsen (1903-6) was the first to sail from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He sailed through Lancaster Sound, down Peel Sound, through James Ross Strait to the American coast, then westward to Alaska. (See also Carver's Travels.)

[Roald Amundsen, *The North-West Passage*; John Barrow, *Voyages of Discovery and Research within the Arctic Regions*, Nellis M. Crouse, *In Quest of the Western Ocean*, and *The Search for the Northwest Passage*; H. D. Traill, *Life of Sir John Franklin*.]

N. M. CROUSE

Northwest Territory, THE, officially "the Territory Northwest of the River Ohio," included the Old Northwest[™] when it was established by Congress July 13, 1787. Already the Ordinance of 1785[™] had provided for the survey of the public land in townships, each six miles square and divided into thirty-six sections of 640 acres. Payment for the land was permitted in specie, or in Continental certificates, and, for one seventh, the land warrants issued to Revolutionary soldiers were accepted. Section sixteen in each township,

the Ordinance set aside for the support of education.

The Ordinance of 1787 outlined the governmental framework. At first there would be an arbitrary administration, with a governor, three judges and a secretary elected by and responsible to Congress. When the population included 5000 free white males of voting age, the Territory would have practically local autonomy, with a legislative assembly, although Congress would still choose the governor. Finally, when any one of the stipulated divisions contained 60,000 free inhabitants it would be admitted into the Union as a state. An important clause in the Ordinance forbade slavery in the Old Northwest.

The two ordinances, modified to meet changing conditions, remained the basic principles for the organization of the Old Northwest, and set precedents for later territorial development.

In 1787 the Northwest Territory had a widely scattered population of some 45,000 Indians and 2000 French. The first legal American settlement was at Marietta[™], April 7, 1788. Gov. St. Clair inaugurated the territorial government, July 15, 1788, forming Washington County between the eastern boundary and the Scioto. January, 1790, he established Hamilton County between the Scioto and the Miami, and in March he set up St. Clair County along the Mississippi north of the Ohio. Winthrop Sargent, Secretary of the Territory, then organized Knox County between the Miami and St. Clair County, and in 1796 he formed Wayne County with Detroit as the county seat. From these basic counties others were set off as population increased.

The Indian menace confined the earliest settlers to the Ohio Valley, but after Wayne's decisive victory at Fallen Timbers, Aug. 20, 1794, and the subsequent Treaty of Greenville[™] the greater part of Ohio was opened up. Population now increased so rapidly that the autonomous stage of government was inaugurated Sept. 4, 1799, with the first meeting of the territorial assembly. Owing to the distance between many of the settlements a division of the Territory became necessary, and in 1800 the area west of a line north from the mouth of the Kentucky was set off as Indiana[™] Territory. The diminished Northwest Territory was further decreased in 1802 when Michigan[™] was annexed to Indiana.

A movement for statehood now began, which was aided by the Republican (Jeffersonian[™]) national victory in 1800. Although the Territory had approximately only 42,000 inhabitants, April 30, 1802, Jefferson approved the Enabling Act. With the first meeting of the state legislature, March 1, 1803, the Northwest Territory gave

place to the State of Ohio⁷, the "first fruits" of the Ordinance of 1787.

[B. W. Bond, Jr., *Civilization of the Old Northwest*; R. C. Downes, *Frontier Ohio, 1788-1803*.]

BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

Norumbega was a name of Indian origin applied vaguely to the New World north of Florida by 16th- and 17th-century cartographers Champlain in 1604 used the name to designate the Penobscot River but no place by that name, as described by early explorers, ever existed.

[B. F. DeCosta, *Norumbega and Its English Explorers*, in Justin Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History*, Vol. III.]

ELIZABETH RING

Norwegian Churches. There are two Norwegian churches in the United States. The largest, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, was formed in 1917 as a result of a merger of three older bodies, the Synod for the Norwegian Church, the United Norwegian Church and the Lutheran Free Church. A smaller, conservative body, the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, was a division from the larger body formed in 1918. The first Norwegian Church in America was formed in 1846 under the leadership of a lay preacher, Elling Eielson. The great majority of the Norwegian churches are in Wisconsin, Minnesota, the Dakotas and Iowa, with a considerable number in Illinois, Michigan, Montana and the Pacific Northwest.

[Alfred Th. Jørgensen, F. Fleisch, A. R. Wentz, eds., *The Lutheran Churches of the World*; J. Magnus Rohne, *Norwegian American Lutheranism up to 1872*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Norwegian Immigration. On Oct. 9, 1825, the diminutive sloop *Restaurationen* landed at New York with fifty-three emigrants after a voyage that had begun on July 4 or 5 at Stavanger in southwestern Norway. Individual Norwegians had sought the New World in colonial times, but this event marked the inauguration of a folk movement that brought to the United States more than 750,000 Norwegians. By 1930 there were 1,100,098 persons of Norwegian birth and of Norwegian and mixed parentage in the United States.

The decade after 1825 witnessed only a trickle of individual Norwegian emigrants to America, but from 1836 the movement grew in volume. The high point before the Civil War was reached in the 1850's, while mounting waves marked the years 1866-73, 1880-93, 1900-14 and 1923-28. The largest single year's immigration from Norway was 28,788 in 1882. In recent years the number of Norwegian immigrants has been below the legal annual quota of 2377.

Not Worth a Continental

The primary causes of the migration were economic and social, with some intrusion of political and religious factors. Norway was swept by a contagious "America fever" as farmers and others compared Norway and America, read "America books" and "America letters," and followed such leaders as Cleng Peerson, Ole Rynning and J. R. Reiersen. No country of Europe save Ireland sent so large a proportion of its population to America as Norway.

The pioneers of 1825 sought lands in western New York, near Rochester. In 1834 some of them made their way to the Fox River Valley of Illinois, and from that point Norwegian settlers advanced from one frontier to another, swarming to the farm lands and towns of Wisconsin, Iowa and Minnesota, and trekking to the Great Plains in the mood of Per Hansa as portrayed in *Giants in the Earth*, Rolvaag's novel about Norwegian "land takers." Groups of Norwegian immigrants settled in the Far West and Texas as well as in New York and other eastern urban centers. The Norwegians broke sod, cut pine, sailed Great Lakes vessels, and tackled hundreds of other jobs; established newspapers of their own, beginning with *Nordlyset* in Wisconsin, 1847; built churches, principally Lutheran; waged fierce theological battles; founded such colleges as Luther, Augsburg and St. Olaf; met problems of transition while conserving some of the cultural resources they had brought with them, including their folk and church music; and made themselves a part of the social and political life of section and nation.

[J. O. Evjen, *Scandinavian Immigrants in New York, 1630-1674*; C. C. Qualey, *Norwegian Settlement in the United States*; T. C. Blegen, *Norwegian Migration to America, 1825-1860*; R. B. Anderson, *First Chapter of Norwegian Immigration*; L. M. Larson, *Changing West*; T. C. Blegen and M. B. Ruud, *Norwegian Emigrant Songs and Ballads*; Knut Gjerset, *Norwegian Sailors in American Waters*; *Norwegian-American Studies and Records*, Vols. 1-10.]

T. C. BLEGEN

"Not Worth a Continental." Five days after the battle of Bunker Hill the Continental Congress authorized the issuance of bills of credit⁹⁹ to the amount of \$2,000,000. During the remainder of the Revolutionary War forty emissions were made in a total amount of \$241,552,780. Depreciation eventually became very marked. With an exchange value in the closing year of the war as low as 1000 to 1, they became a symbol of absolute worthlessness, hence the expression "not worth a continental."

[D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*.]

J. HARLEY NICHOLS

Notification Speech. The practice of giving formal notification of their nomination to the presidential and vice-presidential nominees of the several parties was begun with the congressional caucus⁷, the chairman and secretary of which were designated to notify the caucus nominees and to learn from them whether they would be willing to serve. With the establishment of the national convention⁸ to replace the congressional caucus, the practice of formal notification was continued, and there has developed the practice of formal notification ceremonies, usually held several weeks after the adjournment of the convention, separately for each candidate and at the candidate's home. A committee chosen by the national convention waits upon the candidate at the appointed time and place, the chairman (who is usually, in the case of the presidential committee, the permanent chairman of the convention, and, in the case of the vice-presidential committee, the temporary chairman) makes the notification speech, and the candidate responds. The notification speech is very brief and of little importance, but the acceptance speech becomes one of the most important documents in a presidential campaign, since the candidate takes the opportunity to review at length the principles and platform of his party and to expound the issues.

[Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency*; Charles W. McKenzie, *Party Government in the United States*; Harold R. Bruce, *American Parties and Politics*.]

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL

Nova Cæsarea. See New Cæsarea.

Nudist Movement in America, THE, after earlier sporadic attempts, originated in 1930 in an organized group in New York City. In 1932 there was formed a national association (American Sunbathing Association) which commenced a monthly publication in 1933. In 1939 forty societies are affiliated with this association, with a membership of 8000. Its periodical has a circulation varying seasonally from 50,000 to 100,000. In addition, about 200 nudist groups are listed, and there are probably several thousand such groups with a total nationwide membership of several hundred thousand. Many of them own camps where men, women and children practise nudity together. All social classes, but predominantly the middle class, are represented among the nudists.

[Maurice Parmelee, *Nudism in Modern Life*.]

MAURICE PARMELEE

Nueces River, THE, which empties into Corpus Christi Bay, was the subject of a boundary dis-

pute, first, between the Texas Republic⁹ and Mexico (1836-46), and next, between the United States and Mexico (1846-48). Though as a Spanish or a Mexican province Texas had never extended westward of the Nueces, the Texas Republic claimed the Rio Grande¹⁰ as its boundary. After annexation to the United States, Texas saw its claims supported when President Polk sent troops beyond the Nueces, and then asked Congress to declare war against Mexico for attacking them because they were on American soil. Mexico claimed they were invaders. By the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo¹¹, the Rio Grande became the boundary of Texas.

L. W. NEWTON

Nullification is the act by which a state suspends, within its territorial jurisdiction, a Federal law. The right of nullification was first asserted by Virginia and Kentucky in their Resolutions of 1798¹². The Kentucky Resolutions of 1799 boldly asserted that "nullification" was "the rightful remedy" for infractions of the Constitution. The doctrine of nullification was based upon the theory that the Union was the result of a compact between sovereign states, that the Constitution was a body of instructions drawn up by the states for the guidance of the general government, that the states were the rightful judges of infractions of the Constitution, and that the states were not bound by the acts of their agent when it exceeded its delegated powers. The fundamental principles of nullification underlay the action of the Hartford Convention¹³ (1814); Georgia not only nullified the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Cherokee Indian controversy but prevented their enforcement (see *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia*); and several Northern states nullified the Fugitive Slave Law (1850) by the passage of Personal Liberty Laws¹⁴.

The most noted example of nullification, however, occurred in South Carolina. Opposition to the protective tariff began to develop in the South in the 1820's. This hostility mounted to such proportions that the legislature of South Carolina printed and circulated Calhoun's *Exposition* (1828)¹⁵. This paper reaffirmed the doctrines of 1798 and formulated a program of action: the interposition of the state's veto through the people in sovereign convention assembled. The South Carolinians then rested upon their oars, expecting the Jackson administration to reduce the tariff. Later, when Congress enacted a tariff act (1832) that proclaimed protection¹⁶ a permanent policy, the nullifiers carried the issue to the people. They won control of the legislature and called a state convention (Nov. 19, 1832). This body adopted an Ordinance of Nul-

lification declaring the tariff acts of 1828 and 1832 oppressive, unconstitutional, null and void and not binding on the people of South Carolina. Appeals to the Federal courts were forbidden and state officials were required to take an oath to support the Ordinance. The legislature later passed acts necessary to put the Ordinance into effect. South Carolina expected other Southern states to follow her lead, but none supported nullification, although several protested against protective tariffs.

President Jackson issued a proclamation (Dec. 10, 1832) in which he denounced nullification as rebellion and treason and warned the people of South Carolina that he would use every power at his command to enforce the laws. In a message to Congress he urged modification of the tariff and, later, asked the passage of a "Force Bill"⁹⁰ to enable him to use the army and navy in enforcing the law. Before the date set for the Ordinance to take effect (Feb. 1, 1833) measures for reducing the tariff were introduced into Congress. Consequently, a committee, empowered by the convention to act, suspended the Ordinance until Congress should take final action. Both the Force Bill and the Compromise Tariff⁹¹ were passed by Congress and approved by the President. The convention reassembled (March 11, 1833) and rescinded the Ordinance of Nullification, but nullified the Force Bill. The nullifiers, who had claimed their action peaceable, now argued that the reduction of the tariff duties amply justified their position and action.

[H. V. Ames, *State Documents on Federal Relations*; Frederic Bancroft, *Calhoun and the South Carolina Nullification Movement*; C. S. Boucher, *The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina*; D. F. Houston, *A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*; E. P. Powell, *Nullification and Secession in the United States*.]

FLETCHER M. GREEN

Number 4 (now Charlestown, N. H.) was, when settled in 1740, the most northerly English post in the Connecticut Valley, many miles off in the wilderness, and its chief building a strong fort (1744). Attacked frequently by the French and Indians, it was of great military importance in blocking this line of approach to Massachusetts, which had claimed title also since 1736, and maintained a garrison there. It was a base for several advances on Canada, and later for Stark's troops before the battle of Bennington⁹².

[H. H. Saunderson, *History of Charlestown*; Jeremy Belknap, *History of New Hampshire*.]

HERBERT W. HILL

Nurseries, American, in earliest days, were confined to fruit trees. There is record of the trading of 500 apple trees by Gov. John Endicott

Nursing in the U. S. Army

of Massachusetts Bay Colony⁹³ for 280 acres of land in 1648.

The first nursery devoted to ornamental stock was that of Wm. Prince at Flushing, L. I., in 1730. This nursery was operating for four generations. Bloodgood, Wilson, Parmentier and Hogg all started similar nurseries in or near New York, between 1820 and 1830. Sinclair and Moore at that time were prominent in Baltimore. The famous Long Island nursery of Parsons & Company began in 1830; it was a pioneer in propagating and distributing choice trees and shrubs.

Between 1840 and 1850 Ellwanger & Barry, Maxwell Bros. and W. & T. Smith also became notable nurserymen in New York. Farther afield, J. Berckmanns, from Belgium, started a nursery in Georgia about 1850. Robert Avery, in 1837, started the first nursery in Iowa. Rochester, N. Y., eventually became a great nursery center after P. Barry and Wm. Prince began there in 1840. A. F. Conard with Chas. Dingee were early pioneers in Pennsylvania, starting in 1862; the firm exists today as Conard & Pyle. James Moon of Morrisville, Pa., was an even earlier starter, and his descendants are still nurserymen.

In 1865 T. A. Gary was a pioneer nurseryman at Los Angeles, Calif. W. F. Heikes founded a nursery in Alabama in 1839, and by 1872 it was the largest in the United States. J. Kendrick, at Newton, Mass., began in 1790; H. Lewelling, 1847, was the first nurseryman in Oregon. The fruit trees he distributed brought much wealth to the state. Except where stated, all these old-time nurseries have long since ceased to exist, but in many parts of the country there are numerous nurseries with a record of fifty years or more.

[L. H. Bailey, *Cyclopedia of American Horticulture*.]

T. A. WESTON

Nursing in the U. S. Army is performed by the Army Nurse Corps, by enlisted men of the Medical Department and, in certain instances, by civilian nurses, male and female.

The first request for women nurses came from the Continental Army in 1776. Those chosen were mothers, wives and sisters of the troops. Many women nursed in hospitals during the Civil War, though until the Spanish-American War practically all nursing was performed by army enlisted men. In 1898 women were employed under contract as army nurses. They served also in China during the Boxer Rebellion.

The Army Nurse Corps was authorized by law Feb. 2, 1901 (31 Stat. 753), as an integral part of the Medical Department. The Corps never exceeded 200 until the Mexican border activity in

1916 necessitated a considerable increase. In April, 1917, there were 403. At the time of the World War armistice⁹⁷ there were 21,480 in uniform, of whom 10,400 served overseas. Many were cited for heroic conduct or valor.

The National Defense Act⁹⁸, as amended June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 767), conferred relative rank on the Army Nurse Corps and many of the rights and privileges of army officers, except mileage and pay of grade. Appointments are made by the Surgeon General from unmarried, physically qualified registered nurses, who are graduates of acceptable schools of nursing, and United States citizens, between twenty-two and twenty-eight years of age. They wear insignia of grade, second lieutenant to major. Promotion is determined by length of service and special qualification. Leaves of absence with pay are authorized for one month of each year of completed service. Legislation in 1926 provided for voluntary retirement after thirty years' service, or at the age of fifty years with twenty years' service (44 Stat. 531), and in 1930-31 for the retirement of nurses for physical disability (46 Stat. 790, 1502). There is no army nurse reserve corps, but the National Committee on Red Cross Nursing Service furnishes reserve nurses for the army, navy, Public Health Service, the Veterans' Administration⁹⁹ and other Federal services for military duty in emergency. Women nurses are available for general hospitals and large station hospitals only.

Medical Department enlisted men receive training in first aid and practical nursing. Enlisted for three years they are eligible for promotion through the grades to master sergeant. Additional pay is provided according to length of service and qualification as specialists. Furloughs with pay, thirty days per year, and retirement after thirty years of service are authorized. Civilian nurses, male and female, may be employed by the army under exceptional circumstances or in emergencies.

[Army Medical Bulletin No. 41, *History and Manual of the Army Nurse Corps*, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., Oct. 1, 1937; Arnold Dwight Tuttle, *Handbook for the Medical Soldier*, William Wood and Company, 1927.]

GEORGE A. SCHEIRER

Oaths. See Test Laws.

Oatman Girls, THE, were captured by members of the Tonto tribe of Apache Indians¹⁰⁰ at the crossing of the Gila River in Arizona, April 18, 1854. The father, mother, two daughters and one son were killed, and one son, Lorenzo, left for dead. Olive and Mary Ann were taken away. Lorenzo was nursed to recovery by friendly Pima Indians¹⁰¹ and spent five years looking for his sisters. He finally found Olive, but Mary Ann had

died of hardships. Olive's story of her life among the Apaches has been told and retold by many writers.

[P. I. Wellman, *Death in the Desert*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Oats were brought to North America by New World explorers. Bartholomew Gosnold planted them on Elizabeths Island in Buzzards Bay. They were early grown in Newfoundland and New Netherland. During the colonial era they spread through the English colonies. George Washington had several hundred acres planted to the grain on his farm at Mount Vernon. New York and Pennsylvania remained the leading producing states until the Civil War, being displaced thereafter by Iowa and Illinois. Oats thrive best in a cool climate where rainfall is abundant, but they can be grown in this country from Alaska to Texas. National production rose from 123,000,000 bushels in 1839 to 172,000,000 in 1859, and passed the billion-bushel mark by 1902. In 1937, 1,146,000,000 bushels were produced in the United States, this amount being about one fourth of the world output. Oats are an indispensable rotation and cover crop. As food, they are grown chiefly for animals though a small percentage is humanly consumed. Only a negligible portion of the annual crop is sent abroad.

[Consult several *Bulletins* of the United States Department of Agriculture, and the Department's *Yearbooks*. Harrison John Thornton, *The History of the Quaker Oats Company*.]

HARRISON JOHN THORNTON

Oberlin Movement, THE, in its antislavery aspect was an evangelical agitation throughout the West against slavery. In essence the movement began in 1834 at Lane Seminary in Cincinnati, with an eighteen-day "debate" among the students on slavery. Conducted by a quondam revivalist, Theodore D. Weld, the discussion converted the whole student body, Northerners and Southerners alike, to the duty of antislavery agitation¹⁰². When the trustees of the seminary attempted by repressive regulations to end the agitation, most of the students promptly withdrew, and enrolled next year at Oberlin College. These antislavery evangelists proceeded to convert the community, the Western Reserve¹⁰³ and much of Ohio and the West to the abolition cause.

[G. H. Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844*.]

GILBERT HOBBS BARNES

Oberlin-Wellington Rescue Case, THE (1859), grew out of the release by a "rescue party" from Oberlin, Ohio, of a fugitive slave¹⁰⁴ in the custody

of a Federal officer, at the village of Wellington, nine miles south of Oberlin. The rescuers, mostly citizens of Oberlin and students of the college, were indicted under the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850th. From their jail in Cleveland they published a newspaper, *The Rescuer*, through the barred windows they addressed mass meetings of sympathizers, and in their cells they entertained correspondents of Eastern newspapers and deputations from churches and philanthropic societies. The indictments were shortly dismissed and the rescuers freed.

[J. H. Shipherd, *History of the Oberlin-Wellington Rescue*; H. H. Catterall, *Judicial Cases Concerning American Slavery and the Negro*.]

GILBERT HOBBS BARNES

Oblong, THE, consisted of a narrow strip, containing 61,440 acres, along the eastern borders of Dutchess, Putnam and Westchester counties, which was ceded to New York by Connecticut in 1731 in return for a rectangular strip along the Sound and west of the boundary line which had been confirmed by the crown in 1700. The survey of the boundary line made at this time, however, was satisfactory to neither New York nor Connecticut, and bickering continued until 1860, when a survey was made, which satisfied both states.

In 1731 the Oblong was patented in London to Sir Joseph Eyles & Co. The colonial government of New York, however, patented the same tract to Thomas Hawley and associates. The consequent litigation was terminated by the Revolution, the American patentees remaining in possession.

[Frank Hasbrouck, *History of Dutchess County*.]

A. C. FLICK

Observatories, Astronomical. The first observatory in the territory which became the United States was established during the colonial period by John Winthrop, Jr., who, at Hartford, Conn., Aug. 6, 1664, with a 3½-foot focal length refracting telescope, was under the impression that he was observing the fifth satellite of Jupiter. This same telescope was later presented to Harvard College, and used by Thomas Brattle to observe the positions of the comet of 1680, famous in astronomical history. A later John Winthrop, Hollis Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Harvard, 1738-79, recorded many astronomical phenomena with a 3-inch reflecting telescope. David Rittenhouse of Philadelphia was the first telescope maker of the colonies and built the first designed observatory in 1768. Similar observing stations were established at Brown University, College of William and Mary, and Yale College.

During the first fifty years of the new republic, no steps were taken to found a permanent observatory. However, President Washington's farsighted policy for the encouragement of science stimulated Ferdinand Hassler, a Swiss surveyor, to advocate in 1807 the erection of two observatories for the service of the United States Coast and Geodetic Surveyth. Instruments were obtained in 1816, but no use was made of them. In the meantime, Congress was besieged for funds to establish a national observatory, and in 1825 President John Quincy Adams made the first official report on the need for "lighthouses of the sky." But it was not until 1844 that the first national observatory was established in Washington, D. C. Other permanent observatories were beginning to be built in colleges and universities. In the first half of the 19th century over fifty observatories were established, of which a few of the most important are:

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.	1830
Yale College, New Haven, Conn.	1835
Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.	1838
Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.	1838
Western Reserve University, Hudson, Ohio	1838
Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.	1839
U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.	1839
Georgetown College, Washington, D. C.	1843
Cincinnati University, Cincinnati, Ohio	1848
Dudley Observatory, Albany, N. Y.	1853
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.	1854

With the westward movement and increased wealth, the observatories became larger and better equipped. They also developed in complexity as new instruments and improved methods of research were gradually discovered. The largest of these observatories are:

Lick Observatory, Mt. Hamilton, Calif. (University of California)

Founded 1888; contains equatorially mounted telescopes, namely, a 36-inch and a 12-inch refractor; also a 24-inch reflector.

Yerkes Observatory, Williams Bay, Wis. (University of Chicago)

Founded 1897; contains equatorially mounted telescopes, namely, a 40-inch and a 6-inch refractor; also a 24-inch reflector.

Mt. Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif. (Carnegie Institution of Washington), established 1904. Contains a 100-inch and a 60-inch reflector and two tower telescopes, one 150 feet and the other 60 feet. One horizontal telescope for solar research.

These observatories, with their large and modern

equipment, devote much of their time to photographing distant galaxies, measuring double stars, spectroscopic binaries and variable stars

The universities of Harvard, Yale and Michigan have established auxiliary stations to study special problems in more advantageous climatic localities in the high plateau country of South Africa. In addition, there are two private observatories, the Lowell Observatory at Flagstaff, Ariz., with a 24-inch refractor primarily used to study the surface markings of Mars; and the McMath-Hulbert Observatory at the University of Michigan, with a 50-foot tower telescope, for the purpose of making continuous film records of solar prominences.

Two recent observatories in the United States are the McDonald Observatory at Mt. Lock, Tex., 1936, under the joint control of the University of Texas and the University of Chicago, with an 82-inch reflector, and Mt. Palomar Observatory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, 1938, with a 200-inch reflecting telescope in process of construction

[Elias Loomis, *The Recent Progress of Astronomy*; W. C. Rufus, *Astronomical Observatories in the U. S.* prior to 1848, *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 19.]

FREDERICK E. BRASCH

Ocala Platform, THE, adopted at a meeting of the National Farmers Alliance and Industrial Union at Ocala, Fla., December, 1890, demanded, among other things, the abolition of national banks, increase of money to \$50 per capita, graduated income tax, free and unlimited coinage of silver, establishment of subtreasuries where farmers could obtain money at not exceeding 2% on nonperishable products, and election of United States senators by a direct vote of the people.

[John D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt*.]

W. T. CASH

Occupational Diseases. Very little attention was given to this problem until 1910 when the first conference on industrial disease was held, and when the Illinois legislature appointed a commission to study occupational diseases. The first law requiring the reporting of occupational diseases, drafted by the American Association for Labor Legislation, was enacted by the California legislature in 1911. In 1913 this Association organized the First National Conference on Social Insurance which drafted a bill for health insurance; but to date (1939) no such measure has been passed. The absence of health insurance emphasizes the great need for prevention and compensation for loss due to occupational diseases. The early workmen's compensation laws¹, however, did not cover occupational diseases, and there-

fore did not offer any financial or other inducement to the employer to take measures of prevention

In 1928 the Bureau of Labor Statistics listed 700 hazardous occupations as compared to 900 in 1938, and the number of such diseases is increasing.

After a long period of education and agitation, occupational diseases are now included in the workmen's compensation laws of twenty-two states, three territories, the District of Columbia, and in the Federal law of 1934 covering government employees. Coverage under these acts is of three types. (1) schedule coverage listing specific occupational diseases which are compensable—thirteen jurisdictions list from ten to thirty-one such diseases, (2) blanket coverage for all occupational diseases adopted by ten jurisdictions, (3) use of the word "injury" instead of "accident" in the law—employed by three states.

[Occupational-Disease Legislation in the United States, *Bulletin* No. 652, 1936, U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.]

JOSEPH H. FOTH

Occupations, Changes in. Prior to 1870 changes in occupation among gainfully employed Americans were relatively unimportant. Exclusive of children, more than half of the gainfully occupied persons in 1870 were found in agriculture, lumbering and fishing. From that date, however, a whole new field opened for American capital, and labor migrations and occupational changes became a mass problem. The results of the industrial revolution and its consequent effect upon changes in occupations may be summed up under two headings, (1) the "vertical" division, which includes employers as well as employees in each main industry group, and (2) the "horizontal" stratification, which separates "independent" from "dependent" workers in all industry.

As regards the former, the most striking feature was the general shift in population from the farms to the cities. There were two main reasons for this. First, farm technique improved so greatly that there was less need for agricultural workers. Actually, farmers themselves became machine operators. Traction power, gas engines, electricity—all combined to make farming less burdensome, more productive, and labor saving. Second, the labor demands of an increasingly important industrialism were such that agricultural labor moved in large numbers to the urban centers (*see* Urban Drift).

From the 1870's, when the movement began, to about 1920 (after which an increasingly complex economic system brought new changes), this

new urban population went mainly into the industrial fields. Mines and factories provided a large outlet for the new workers. Technological improvements in manufacturing processes helped create demands for labor in the factories, and the mines were kept busy providing fuel and raw materials for manufacturing industries. In 1870 23.5% of all gainfully employed workers were in the mines and factories. By 1920 this figure had risen to 33.2%. Other fields into which the influx moved were the trade and transportation occupations which increased from 9.1% in 1870 to 18.0% in 1920, the clerical field which increased from 1.7% to 7.2%, the professional service occupations which rose from 2.7% to 5.4%, and other public services which increased from 0.6% to 1.6%. During the same years, the figure for gainfully employed farm workers dropped from 52.8% to 25.8%.

After 1920, although agricultural employment continued its decline to 21.3%, the mining and manufacturing field showed its first drop since 1870; gainfully employed workers therein fell to 30.6% in 1930. This slack was taken up somewhat by increases in employment in other occupations. From 1920 to 1930 the trade and transportation fields advanced to 20.7%. The clerical service field increased to 8.2%. Professional service expanded to 6.5%. The largest increase was in the domestic and personal service occupations which increased from 8.8 to 11.3%.

The "horizontal" or economic-position division of occupational classes is more difficult to make clearly, for exact separation of the economically "independent" class from the wages and salary (or economically "dependent") class is almost impossible. Inexact estimates would place the entrepreneur figure at about 10% of those gainfully employed. If proprietors and officials of corporations and the professional classes are included, the above figure will be almost one third of the gainfully employed. In any case, there has been a steady decline in the number of independent enterprisers. Fifty years ago the percentage was well over half, mainly accounted for by the agricultural occupations.

[C. R. Daugherty, *Labor Problems in American Industry*.]

CARROLL R. DAUGHERTY

Officers' Reserve Corps. First established by the National Defense Act²⁰ of 1916, submerged by World War officer procurement and utilization, and reorganized by the amendments of 1920, the Officers' Reserve Corps classified and commissioned civilian volunteer veterans of the World War, and graduates of Citizens' Military Training Camps and Reserve Officers' Training

Corps units²¹ established by that act. Its function has been to retain, and gradually replace by school-trained citizens, the experienced civilian leaders of 1917-18. Its members are "assigned" to units of the Organized Reserves, continuing in name and locality the combat divisions of the American Expeditionary Force²² and other essential smaller organizations, and to inactive regiments of the Regular Army—both practically devoid of enlisted personnel. They have had "active duty" training of fourteen days every five years with troops or at unit schools, and longer periods at army service schools, with full officer's pay and allowances in grade, and also "inactive" training without remuneration in localized evening assemblies and in correspondence courses. They assisted materially in administering the Civilian Conservation Corps²³ from 1933 to 1939. Commencing with 45,573 in 1919, the number commissioned as reserve officers rose to 133,485 in 1933 and declined to 111,169 in 1936.

[*Annual Reports of the Secretary of War*; O. L. Spaulding, *The United States Army in War and Peace*.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Officers' Training Camps. Sudden military expansion in 1917 demanded more trained officers than the newly established Officers' Reserve Corps²⁴ could furnish. Consequently sixteen officers' training camps for civilian candidates, from May 15 to Aug. 15, produced 27,341 leaders for the enlarged army. Later camps selected and trained 17,237 civilians from Aug. 27 to Nov. 27, 1917, and 11,657 men with prior enlisted or military-school experience from Jan. 5 to April 19, 1918. Subsequently, training for commissions for men already enrolled was given in division camps, at special centers, and in France. At the Armistice²⁵ 46,000 were in training. Approximately 145,000 college students were inducted in September, 1918, into a Students' Army Training Corps established at the institutions themselves; but the war ended before any of these were commissioned. All training under this system was abolished with the Armistice.

[J. Dickinson, *The Building of an Army*; W. A. Ganoe, *History of the United States Army*; *Annual Reports of the Secretary of War*, 1917, 1918.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Official Records. See Archives.

Ogallala, Nebr., named for one of the most powerful bands of Teton Sioux Indians, was established by two brothers, Philip J. and Thomas Lonergan, in 1869, when they brought a trail herd of cattle from Frio County, Texas (see

Cattle Drives), and wintered them at Ogallala, then only a water-tank station on the new Union Pacific Railroad^o.

Shipping facilities for cattle were established by the railroad at Ogallala in 1874, and the town became the terminus for one of the important Texas cattle trails. This cattle-drive business was in part diverted to Cheyenne, Wyo., in 1876, when the latter became a shipping point, but for many years Ogallala continued as a cow town^o with a lively reputation. In its early days it was a rendezvous for many desperate Western characters, including "Doc" Middleton, Nebraska outlaw leader; Luke Short, noted quick-shot gunman; and the Joel Collins outfit of train robbers.

[A. T. Andreas, *History of Nebraska; Nebraska History Magazine*, April-June, 1933.]

PAUL I. WELLMAN

Ogden Purchase. In 1826 the Ogden Company purchased from the Indians the lands comprising the reservations of Caneadea, Canawaugus, Big Tree, Squawky Hill, Gardeau, and portions of Buffalo Creek, Tonawanda and Cattaraugus, for the sum of \$48,260. With the understanding that the Indians were to be moved to lands in the West, in 1838 a majority of the chiefs were prevailed upon to sell the remainder of their reservations in New York State to the company for \$202,000. As there was strong opposition to the sale by many of the Indians and their white friends, concessions were made whereby the Indians were allowed to retain their lands in the Cattaraugus and Allegheny Reserves.

[Buffalo Historical Society *Publications*, Vol. 24.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Ogden v. Saunders, a suit involving the constitutionality of many state bankruptcy laws, was brought before the U. S. Supreme Court by Ogden, who sought a discharge in bankruptcy under New York legislation enacted in 1801. In March, 1827, the Court by a close division upheld the validity of the legislation in dispute, but restricted its application to the state in which it was enacted. Chief Justice John Marshall gave his only dissenting opinion upon a constitutional question in this important, although not altogether popular, decision.

[C. Warren, *The Supreme Court in U. S. History*; J. P. Hall, *Cases on Constitutional Law*.]

RAY W. IRWIN

Ogden's Hole (Utah), a place of rendezvous for trading in the early days of the fur trappers (see Trappers' Rendezvous), occupied a sheltered cove in the Rocky Mountains near the northeast shore of the Great Salt Lake. It was

named after Peter Skeen Ogden, a Hudson's Bay Company^o trapper, as was the present city of Ogden, which stands on the same site.

[H. M. Chittenden, *History of the Fur Trade of the Far West*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Ogdensburg. On this site, in 1749, François Picquet, a Sulpician priest, founded the mission of La Présentation, and erected a small fort which was soon partially destroyed by the Mohawks^o. The post was repaired, but fearing future attacks, Picquet persuaded the French governor to erect a stronger fortification of four stone bastions with curtains of cedar, surrounded by a large moat and entrenchment. The purpose of the establishment was for the sheltering of those Indians of the Five Nations^o, principally Onondagas, who were inclined to settle under French protection.

Upon the abandonment of Fort Frontenac^o in 1758, the sustenance of Fort Niagara and the posts to the south and west depended upon La Présentation and Point au Baril. After the surrender of Fort Niagara^o, the French abandoned La Présentation and the British garrisoned the post as a protection for their fur trade^o. In 1776 the fort was repaired and remained under British control until relinquished to the Americans by the terms of Jay's Treaty in 1796 (see Border Forts, The Evacuation of), when permanent settlement was begun under the proprietorship of Samuel Ogden.

In 1812 an attack by a British flotilla was repulsed by Gen. Brown's troops who had been sent to reinforce the garrison, and the construction of Fort Oswegatchie was begun but not completed when, in 1813, the British captured and partly destroyed the town.

[P. S. Garand, *The History of the City of Ogdensburg*.]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

"**Oh! Susanna**," a song of the old Negro minstrel or nonsense type, was written and composed by Stephen Collins Foster and published in the spring of 1848. It was one of Foster's earliest successful songs, though he is said to have received only \$100 for it. It became very popular that summer, when there was much immigration to Oregon. Parodies began to be written in which "Oregon" was substituted for "Alabama" in the original version. In the spring of 1849, when the Gold Rush started, "California" was the next substitution, and the whimsical ballad became in effect the theme song of America's most remarkable mass movement. It was sung on vessels rounding Cape Horn and by the campfires of the overland voyagers. In the East, it was

played at balls as a polka or quadrille and by military bands as a quickstep, and was arranged with variations for band and solo piano. It became popular even in foreign countries.

[John Tasker Howard, *Stephen Foster, America's Troubadour*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Ohio. The legislature of the Northwest Territory⁹⁹, under the influence of Gov. Arthur St. Clair, Federalist⁹⁹, and his following, chiefly from Marietta and Cincinnati, favored dividing the territory along the Scioto River, but a Chillicothe Republican group, led by Thomas Worthington, won the support of the Republican Congress. The Enabling Act of April 30, 1802, defined the western boundary as the meridian from the mouth of the Great Miami northward to a line drawn eastward from the southern bend of Lake Michigan and authorized a constitutional convention to meet in November.

The thirty-five delegates drew up, in twenty-five days, a simple, democratic constitution which was sent to Congress without being referred to the voters. Its chief characteristics were a weak governor, with no veto and very limited appointing powers, and a powerful general assembly, which appointed state officials and both supreme and common pleas judges. White adult male taxpayers could vote.

Congress extended Federal laws over the state, Feb. 19, 1803, and the first legislature convened on March 1. Edward Tiffin had been elected first governor. Jeffersonian Republicans⁹⁹ dominated political life for many years, though divisions between radical and conservative wings often were fought out at the polls. In 1809 impeachment proceedings were instituted in the assembly against certain judges for declaring an act of the legislature unconstitutional, but failing by this method, the radical majority struck at the judiciary by the Sweeping Resolution⁹⁹. For a time Tammany societies⁹⁹ were organized to enforce party solidarity.

Chillicothe⁹⁹ was the capital, 1803-10 and 1812-16, Zanesville 1810-12, and Columbus after 1816. During the War of 1812 Fort Meigs and Fort Stephenson were unsuccessfully attacked by the British and Indians in 1813, but Perry's victory on Lake Erie⁹⁹ ended all danger of invasion.

Hostility toward the Bank of the United States showed itself in an attempt to tax the Ohio branches (1819), but the case of *Osborn v. Bank of the United States*⁹⁹ settled the issue despite the defiant states' rights attitude of the assembly. The year 1825 brought legislation which laid the foundations of a tax-supported system

of common schools, and created, after long discussion, an extensive canal program of incalculable importance in the economic development of the state (*see* Ohio State Canals). The chief artificial waterways were the Miami Canal (from Cincinnati to Toledo) and the Ohio Canal (from Portsmouth to Cleveland via Newark). With numerous branches, the whole system was essentially completed by 1847. By that time, however, the competition of the railroads had begun and by the close of the 1850's the canal era was over.

In 1836 the long-standing Ohio-Michigan boundary dispute⁹⁹ was settled peaceably. By 1842 the last Indian tribe in Ohio (the Wyandots⁹⁹ of Upper Sandusky) had been moved west of the Mississippi (*see* Indian Removal). The increasing number of free Negroes⁹⁹, however, stimulated sharp racial antagonisms, especially in southern Ohio. On the other hand, antislavery societies⁹⁹ increased in numbers and influence, especially on the Western Reserve⁹⁹ where Oberlin College served as the first co-racial (and coeducational) institution of higher learning in the United States. Ohio became the most important state in the activities of the so-called "Underground Railroad"⁹⁹. At the same time immigrants (largely Germans and Irish) found new homes in Ohio, not without incurring some hostility from the native Americans.

Ohio gave her electoral vote for Clay in 1824, but after his elimination her congressmen helped to elect John Quincy Adams in the House election of 1825. The state swung to Jackson in 1828 and 1832, but thereafter became Whig⁹⁹ in national elections until 1848 when the Free Soil⁹⁹ movement divided the Whigs and gave the state to the Democrats⁹⁹. Sen. Thomas Corwin led Ohio Whigs in opposing the Mexican War. In state politics conservative Democrats joined the Whigs in opposing various more or less extreme types of bank reform advocated by radical Democrats. The Kelley Act (1845), a conservative Whig measure, long remained the basis of the state's banking system.

The year 1851 marked the creation of the last of Ohio's eighty-eight counties and the completion of the state's second (and present) constitution, the work of a Democratic-controlled convention (1850-51). Popularly ratified and effective Sept. 1, 1851, it restricted the formation of new counties, limited the state debt to \$750,000, prohibited further state debts for internal improvements and limited laws for the conferring of corporate powers to general rather than special acts. The "uniform rule" (repealed in 1929) was the basic principle of taxation. A

popular referendum every twenty years upon the desirability of a constitutional convention was provided for.

Like other Northwestern states, Ohio was swept into the Anti-Nebraska movement in 1854, which became the Republican party⁷⁷ in 1855, electing Salmon P. Chase as governor, though the aid of the Know Nothings⁷⁸ was an important factor in this success. Thereafter Ohio was consistently Republican in national elections until 1932, except for one electoral vote cast for Cleveland in 1892 and Wilson's victories in 1912 and 1916. Natives of Ohio headed the Republican ticket in eleven elections, seven Republican Presidents being of Ohio birth. James M. Cox (1920) has been the only Democratic nominee from Ohio.

Ohioans favored compromise in 1860-61, the general assembly ratifying a proposed constitutional amendment to guarantee slavery in the slave states. The outbreak of the Civil War, however, produced a wave of loyalty, and a merger of Republicans and War Democrats created the Union party⁷⁹, which elected David Tod, War Democrat, governor by a large majority. Tod's term (1862-64) was troubled by an outbreak of antiwar activities, exemplified by the Holmes County Rebellion and the arrest of Vallandigham⁸⁰. The overwhelming defeat of the latter for governor by John Brough, War Democrat, saved the Northwest for the Union and discredited the Copperhead⁸¹ movement nationally. Morgan's raid⁸² gave the state its only taste of fighting, though Cincinnati had been threatened by Confederate advances in 1862 (*see Kentucky, Invasion of*). The state contributed 346,326 soldiers to the Union Army, did much war relief work, and claimed as residents or former residents Generals Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, McClellan, McDowell, Rosecrans, Buell, McPherson and others, and Secretaries Chase and Stanton in Lincoln's Cabinet.

The Ohio legislature ratified the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments⁸³, though the voters rejected a proposed Negro suffrage amendment to the state constitution in 1867. Agrarian party movements received slight support in the state, though the Democrats were friendly to the greenback position in the 1870's and to free silver in the 1890's⁸⁴. Except for the liquor traffic state issues were usually subordinated to national ones.

Ohio's essential conservatism, product of its industrialization and best illustrated by Marcus A. Hanna, was shaken by the progressive movement⁸⁵ of the early 1900's, which resulted in the constitutional convention of 1912. A group of

constitutional amendments was adopted including the initiative and referendum, direct primaries, municipal home rule⁸⁶, and provisions for social and economic reforms. Although Ohio had elected Democratic governors only four times between 1855 and 1905, since the latter year the Republicans have been successful only in 1914, 1920, 1928 and 1938.

One of the greatest disasters in Ohio's history came in March, 1913, when unprecedented rains created devastating floods⁸⁷ in every part of the state. Over 400 lives were lost and property damages amounted to \$300,000,000. The Miami Valley, which had suffered most, developed, under a state Conservancy Act, a great system of reservoirs designed to prevent the recurrence of such a disaster. On a less extensive scale other parts of the state adopted measures for flood control⁸⁸.

Ohio enthusiastically supported the World War, sending over 200,000 men into military service, those going overseas being found chiefly in the 37th, 42nd, 83rd and 84th divisions. Camp Sherman at Chillicothe was an important cantonment for drafted men. A severe Criminal Syndicalism Act was passed in 1919.

Ohio's economic life underwent revolutionary changes in the years 1850-1900, the spread of the railroad, the changes in methods of farming, and the development of manufacturing and mining completely altering the character of the essentially agricultural society of the first half century of statehood. While Cincinnati⁸⁹ was the most important manufacturing city west of the Alleghenies in 1850, and industrial development had made some headway in other Ohio Valley cities, the northern half of the state was almost entirely rural. Within a generation the whole picture changed. The inflow of Lake Superior ore, the accessibility of coal, discoveries of oil and gas, and cheap transportation transformed many parts of northern Ohio. Iron and steel centering in the Cleveland-Youngstown sections, rubber at Akron and pottery at East Liverpool illustrate the diversified character of the state's industrialism.

[E. H. Roseboom and F. P. Weisenburger, *A History of Ohio*; E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, *History of Ohio*.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM
F. P. WEISENBURGER

Ohio, Army of the. On Nov. 9, 1861, Union troops which had been operating in Kentucky, with others, were constituted as the Army of the Ohio, and were at Shiloh and at the siege of Corinth⁹⁰. In the summer of 1862 the Army of the Ohio repelled Bragg's invasion of Kentucky⁹¹.

On Oct. 30, 1862, Rosecrans relieved Buell and the Army of the Ohio became the Army of the Cumberland^m.

A new Army of the Ohio was later formed and Gen. H. G. Wright placed in command. He was succeeded by Gen. A. E. Burnside. In the fall of 1863 the army was ordered to the defense of Knoxville^m. Burnside was replaced by Gen. J. G. Foster, who, on Jan. 28, 1864, gave way to Gen. J. M. Schofield, who commanded the Army of the Ohio until Jan. 17, 1865, when it was merged into the Department of the Cumberland. In this interval the army participated in the Atlanta Campaign^m and was then detached to aid Thomas in repelling Hood's (C.) invasion of Tennessee (*see* Hood's Tennessee Campaign).

[F. Phisterer, *Statistical Record*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Ohio, Falls of the, are really rapids caused by ledges covering the river bed for half a mile. Flatboats^m often went down the Falls in high water, but steamboat freight and passengers were usually transported overland from the harbor just above the Falls to Portland or Shippingport below. LaSalle's alleged discovery (1669) has been questioned, but Céloron (1739) preceded all known British explorers. In 1773 Lord Dunmore granted land at the Falls to John Connolly, who, with John Campbell, sent a few temporary settlers (1775). On May 27, 1778, about twenty families, accompanying Clark's Northwest Campaign^m, settled on Corn Island at the Falls, removing to the mainland at Christmas (*See also* Nelson, Fort.) The name "Louisville" was adopted presumably because of the Franco-American Alliance^m. Connolly's claim was escheated because of his Tory activities, and town trustees were authorized to sell lots to settlers (1780). Most of the money went to pay Campbell's claims against Connolly. In 1795 elected trustees were authorized to levy taxes and supervise town affairs. The westward movement and the introduction of the steamboat^m (1811) stimulated trade. Population growth caused incorporation as the city of Louisville (1828). (*See also* Louisville and Portland Canal.)

[J. S. Johnston, ed., *Memorial History of Louisville*.]

W. C. MALLALIEU

Ohio, Forks of the, was the name given to the junction of the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers, to form the Ohio River. Historically, the terminology is often applied to the surrounding country or is used as the equivalent of such terms as Fort Duquesne, Pittsburgh, or Fort Pitt.

Ohio Company of Associates

As many floods have amply demonstrated, the Allegheny, the Monongahela and the Ohio are topographically great gorges through which the western drainage of the Appalachian system of the north flows off to the Mississippi River^m. These gorges were the natural approach to the Middle West from the Middle Atlantic seaboard. The Forks of the Ohio thus became a natural gateway to the West in American westward migration.

Strangely enough, the Ohio Company of Virginia of 1748^m failed to grasp at once the significance of the Forks and the point of land lying between the Allegheny and the Monongahela, but planned to establish a post down the Ohio at a point now known as McKees Rocks, so named from Alexander McKee, noted Tory, one of the early residents of the place. Neither such famous fur traders as Arnout Viele and Croghan, nor explorers like Céloron, Father Bonnecamps and Christopher Gist seem to have appreciated the importance of the Forks of the Ohio. It remained for George Washington on his journey to Fort LeBeuf^m, in December, 1753, to note its significance and through his widely published diary to give it, after 1754, enduring fame. In Washington's words, "I spent some time in reviewing the Rivers and the Land in the Fork; which I think extremely well situated for a Fort, as it has the absolute Command of both Rivers."

The Ohio Company in February, 1754, began construction of a rude fort on the point. Before its completion, the French under Contre-cœur captured the place. From April, 1754, to late 1758, Fort Duquesne^m, under French regime, dominated not only the Forks of the Ohio, but the entire country eastward to the Alleghenies and westward to the Mississippi River. Captured and renamed Pittsburgh by Gen. John Forbes, and protected by Fort Pitt^m, the region remained under British supervision for more than a decade, mainly a garrison and trading post. Slowly, with settlement of the region, the trading post became a commercial village. It was chartered as a borough in 1794.

[S. J. and E. H. Buck, *The Planting of Civilization in Western Pennsylvania*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Ohio and Erie Canal. *See* Ohio State Canals.

Ohio Company of Associates, THE (1787), developed from the interest in western settlement of a group of Revolutionary War officers. Two New Englanders, Generals Rufus Putnam and Benjamin Tupper, were its leading spirits. Due to their activity, "A Piece called Information" appeared in several Massachusetts newspapers

in January, 1786, inviting officers and soldiers to form "an association by the name of the Ohio Company." All persons interested were to elect delegates to meet at the Bunch of Grapes Tavern in Boston on March 1. Eleven men met on that date and organized the company. They planned to raise \$1,000,000, to be subscribed for in shares of \$1000 each, payable in Continental certificates, plus ten dollars in gold or silver, the fund to be used to purchase land "north westerly of the River Ohio."

A year elapsed before 250 shares had been subscribed and the company was ready to ask Congress for land. Gen. Samuel Parsons proving unsatisfactory as an agent, Rev. Manasseh Cutler was selected to represent the company before Congress. By skilful lobbying⁹⁰ and by effecting an alliance with a group of New York speculators headed by William Duer, Cutler arranged a joint purchase: nearly 5,000,000 acres for the Scioto Company⁹¹ and 1,500,000 acres for the Ohio Company. Reservations of one section in each township for schools, another for religion, three for later disposal by Congress and two whole townships for a university increased the Ohio Company's total to 1,781,760 acres. It was to pay \$500,000 down and the same amount when the survey was completed, but payment could be made in government securities, worth perhaps twelve cents on the dollar. The tract lay north of the Ohio River between the Seventh Range and the western limit of the Seventeenth (see Seven Ranges, The, Survey of). Cutler also helped in the formation and adoption of the Ordinance of 1787⁹².

The Ohio Company later encountered financial difficulties and could not complete its payments. However, Congress granted title to 750,000 acres, and added 214,285 acres to be paid for with army warrants (see Land Bounties) and 100,000 acres to be granted free to actual settlers. More than two thirds of the shareholders remained in the East, thus adding absentee ownership to the complications of inaugurating settlement on the exposed frontier. It required many years to arrange for the division of the lands and other assets among the 817 shareholders. Meetings were still being held as late as 1831 although nearly all the assets had long since been allocated. The great achievement of the company was the successful beginning of organized settlement north of the Ohio River at Marietta⁹³ in 1788.

[A. B. Hulbert, ed., *The Records of the Ohio Company*, Marietta College Historical Collections. Vols. I, II; E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, *History of Ohio*, Vol. II.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Ohio Company of Virginia, THE, was a partnership of Virginia gentlemen, a Maryland frontiersman and a London merchant organized in 1747 to engage in land speculation and trade with the Indians in the territory claimed by Virginia west of the mountains. The company petitioned the crown for a grant of 500,000 acres of land in the upper Ohio Valley or elsewhere in the West 200,000 acres to be granted at once on condition that 200 families be settled on the land within seven years. Early in 1749 the governor of Virginia was directed to make the grant. The company built a storehouse for trade goods on the Potomac opposite the mouth of Wills Creek and sent Christopher Gist⁹⁴ on exploring expeditions in 1750 and 1751. The Indians having been induced at the Treaty of Logstown⁹⁵ to permit settlement south of the Ohio, a road was opened across the mountains, probably in 1752, and in 1753 Gist and a number of others sent out by the company settled in what is now Fayette County, Pa. In the same year the company built another storehouse on the Monongahela at the site of Brownsville (see Redstone Old Fort), and early in 1754 it began, with the co-operation of the governor of Virginia, the erection of Fort Prince George at the Forks of the Ohio⁹⁶. The capture of this uncompleted fort by the French, and the war that ensued (see French and Indian War), resulted in the withdrawal of the settlers, and plans of the company to renew its activities in the region after the fall of Fort Duquesne⁹⁷ were frustrated by the prohibition of settlement west of the mountains (see Proclamation of 1763). An agent dispatched by the company to England to seek a renewal of its grant was unsuccessful in his quest, and in 1770 he exchanged its claims for two shares in the Vandalia Company⁹⁸. The Ohio Company was significant as a manifestation of the intention of England, and also of Virginia, to expand across the mountains into the Ohio Valley, and its activities played a part in bringing on the final contest between the French and the English for control of the interior.

[C. W. Alvord, *Mississippi Valley in British Politics*; K. P. Bailey, *The Ohio Company of Virginia*.]

OLON J. BUCK

"Ohio Idea," THE, refers to the proposal to redeem the five-twenty bonds in greenbacks⁹⁹ instead of coin (1867-68). Launched as an inflationary measure by the Cincinnati *Enquirer*, its popularity forced both political parties in the Middle West to endorse it, although neither committed itself outright to inflation.

[C. M. Destler, *Origin and Character of the Pendle-*

ton Plan, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXIV; D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*.]

CHESTER McA. DESTLER

Ohio-Michigan Boundary Dispute, THE. The Ordinance of 1787th and the Ohio enabling act of 1802 defined the northern boundary of the proposed state as an east-and-west line drawn through "the southerly bend or extreme of Lake Michigan." Ohio was supposed to include Maumee Bay on Lake Erie, as 18th-century maps generally placed the southern end of Lake Michigan north of its true location. Advised by an old trapper that such a line would intersect Lake Erie south of Maumee Bay, the Ohio constitutional convention (1802) changed the boundary to make it reach that lake at the northernmost cape of Maumee Bay. Congress never formally assented to the change and Michigan Territory later claimed the boundary as stated in the Ordinance. A long controversy ensued, reaching a climax in the bloodless "Toledo War"th of 1833-36. Congress, after much difficulty, compromised matters by giving the disputed strip to Ohio (some 400 square miles) but compensating Michigan with statehood and a tract of 9000 square miles on the Upper Peninsulath.

[*Ohio Co-operative Topographic Survey, Final Report*, Vol. I, The Ohio-Michigan Boundary, E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, *History of Ohio*, Vol. III.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Ohio National Stage Company, THE, with its headquarters at Columbus, operated stagecoaches on the western division of the National Roadth after its completion to that city in 1833. It established branch lines to all parts of Ohio and western Pennsylvania, and by 1844 had become a near-monopoly, having absorbed all its rivals but one. Railroad competition ended its importance in the 1850's.

[A. B. Hulbert, *The Cumberland Road, Historic Highways of America*, Vol. X.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Ohio River, Early Discovery of the, cannot be fixed with certainty. In the first half of the 17th century, rumors came to the French in Canada and the English in Virginia of the great river beyond the mountains, and occasional explorers may even have reached the Ohio Valley. From the scanty records the one justifiable conclusion is that a party of Frenchmen led by LaSalle first discovered the Ohio River.

From the Indians LaSalle had heard of the "Great River," in the Iroquoisth tongue, Ohio, that, flowing westward, plunged over a waterfall, and he became convinced he could descend it to the Gulf of California and perhaps even to China. Leaving Montreal, July 6, 1669, LaSalle

Ohio State Antislavery Society

with twenty men went up the St. Lawrence, along the southern shore of Lake Ontario, and across country to the Grand River Valley in northeastern Ohio. From there they pushed on to the Allegheny, and down the Ohio to the marshy country below the Falls at Louisville. Here, deserted by his men, LaSalle abandoned his original plan of going down to the mouth of the Ohio, and returned to Canada.

News of LaSalle's voyage quickly spread. Joliet's map in 1674 gave the general course of the Ohio as far as the Falls, and Franquelin'sth map in 1682 showed that it flowed into the Mississippi. Later French explorers located the chief tributaries from the north, notably the Wabash, the Ouabache of this early period. Frequently these early maps showed the Wabash as the main river into which the Ohio flowed, and to the latter many of them gave the alternative name, *La Belle Rivière*.

The Virginians, too, sought the great river west of the mountains that reputedly flowed into the South Sea. About 1648 Gov. Berkeley proposed an expedition across the mountains, and other adventurous souls followed his example, although none of these plans materialized. It was left to Abraham Wood, a fur trader at Fort Henry, now Petersburg, on the Appomattox, actually to mark the path from Virginia across the mountains. According to unverified reports Wood himself, between 1654 and 1664, discovered several branches of the Ohio and the Mississippi. If so, he even preceded LaSalle in the Ohio Valley. Certainly in 1671 he despatched a trading party that crossed to the New River on the western slope. In the 18th century Gov. Spotswood urged an English advance from Virginia, and in 1716 at the head of the romantic Knights of the Golden Horseshoeth he reached the south branch of the Shenandoah.

Gradually the Virginia explorers, now joined by the fur tradersth from Pennsylvania, opened up the chief passes across the Appalachians, marking out the courses of the rivers that flowed from the summit of the mountains to the Ohio, and thus coming into the chief theater of French enterprise. By the middle of the 18th century these English explorations, together with those of the French fur traders, had made it possible to draw up a fairly accurate map of the entire Ohio Valley.

[Francis Parkman, *Discovery of the Great West*; Justin Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Vol. IV.]

BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

Ohio State Antislavery Society, THE. Organized in 1835 by abolitionth converts of Theo-

dore D. Weld and his helpers (*see* Oberlin Movement), the Ohio Society shortly became second only to the New York Society among the state auxiliaries of the American Antislavery Society⁷⁰. During the decade after 1840 its leaders, Salmon P. Chase, Gamaliel Bailey, Leicester King and Joshua Giddings, converted the society to political action. By 1848 it had practically merged with the Free Soil party⁷¹.

[T. C. Smith, *The Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the Northwest*, G. H. Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844*.]

GILBERT HOBBS BARNES

Ohio State Canals. Surveys for canals were authorized by the Ohio legislature in 1822, and in 1825 the building of two major canals was authorized. One, the Ohio and Erie, left Lake Erie at the village of Cleveland⁷², followed the Cuyahoga Valley for several miles, then continued via Akron, Massillon, Coshocton, Newark and the Scioto Valley to the Ohio River at Portsmouth; the other, the Miami and Erie, ran from the Ohio at Cincinnati⁷³ up to Dayton, with the promise that it would later be extended to Lake Erie. Work began at once, and in 1832 the whole 308-mile course of the Ohio and Erie was open. The extension of the Miami and Erie to the Maumee River at Defiance and via that stream to Toledo and Lake Erie was begun in 1833 and was theoretically open to the Maumee by 1836, but boats did not get through to Toledo until 1843. Ohio was blessed with wise and honest management in the building of her canals, and for several years they contributed enormously to the state's growth and prosperity. Beginning in 1835-36, however, the legislature authorized the building of several branch canals which were of little value and which only laid serious financial burdens upon the state. The halcyon days of the Ohio canals were from 1845 to 1857. Then railroad competition began slowly throttling them. After 1863 bits of the two main canals began to be obliterated, though the last of them did not vanish until around 1910.

[Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Towpaths*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Ohio Valley, THE, forms a natural link between the Appalachians and the Mississippi Valley. Also, it binds together the Gulf coast and the Great Lakes region. Its strategic location, its numerous navigable streams, its fertile soil and natural resources mark a region admirably adapted to early settlement. At first LaSalle was enthusiastic over its possibilities, but the Iroquois⁷⁴ controlled the upper Ohio Valley, and instead, the French turned to the Maumee-Wabash region.

Gradually, traders came to the Ohio Valley from Virginia and Pennsylvania, and occasionally from South Carolina. Logstown⁷⁵, eighteen miles below the Forks of the Ohio⁷⁶, developed a flourishing trade with the Indians. This English advance soon provoked a struggle with the French. In 1749 Céloron⁷⁷ de Blainville made his famous voyage down the Allegheny and the Ohio to the Miami, planting a lead plate at each important tributary to assert French claims. The English lost the opportunity to found an adequate stronghold, and the French established a series of forts in the upper Ohio Valley, even though Gov. Dinwiddie sent Washington to warn them from land the English claimed (*see* LeBeauf, Fort, Washington's Mission to). In 1758 the English captured Fort Duquesne⁷⁸ at the Forks of the Ohio, rechristening it Fort Pitt⁷⁹, and during the Revolution it became the strategic center from which the Americans controlled the Ohio Valley. Settlers now flocked in. The Ohio became the dividing line between free and slave territory, but the sturdy population from both banks of the river united in the War of 1812⁸⁰ to fight the British and the Indians. This community of interests has developed especially since the abolition of slavery. Problems of transportation, of flood control⁸¹ and of water pollution have come into the foreground, which in place of consideration by individual states demand action by the entire Ohio Valley as a distinct sectional division of the Union.

[D. B. Crouse, *The Ohio Gateway*; A. B. Hulbert, *The Ohio River, A Course of Empire*, F. J. Turner, *The Ohio Valley in American History*, in *The Frontier in American History*.]

BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

Oil Exchanges, Early. After the completion of the Drake well in 1859 and the drilling of others, buyers and sellers of petroleum gathered on the streets, in hotels and in telegraph offices either at Titusville or Oil City, or elsewhere, in order to buy and sell oil. The organization of the Titusville Board of Trade in 1865, the assignment of a special railway passenger car to oilmen traveling between Oil City and Titusville after 1866 and the establishment of the Oil Dealers' Exchange at Petroleum Centre in 1867 represented steps in the development of regular oil exchanges. The first permanently organized oil exchange was established at Titusville in January, 1871, a second at Franklin and a third at Oil City in April and May respectively.

[Paul H. Giddens, *The Birth of the Oil Industry*.]

PAUL H. GIDDENS

Oil Industry. The existence of petroleum deposits in the United States has been known for

over 300 years, but the oil industry itself is comparatively young. The earliest mention of petroleum in the United States occurred in a letter dated July 18, 1627, from Joseph de la Roche D'Allion, a Franciscan⁷ missionary, which described a visit to the oil springs near what is now the town of Cuba, N. Y. The letter was published in G. Sagard's *Histoire du Canada et Voyage des Missionnaires Recollects* in 1636.

Many brine wells, which were drilled for salt⁷, as early as 1806 produced some oil; however, it was considered a nuisance, and little effort was made to collect it. A few of the more enterprising operators burned the oil to evaporate the water and obtain the salt.

The Indians, and later the white settlers, used the petroleum as a medicine and for lighting although it burned with a smoky flame and an offensive odor. It was skimmed from the creeks and oil seeps, bottled and sold as a medicine, purporting to be a sure cure for, among other things, blindness, rheumatism, burns, coughs, colds, sprains and baldness. In 1833 S. P. Hildreth, writing about the early uses of petroleum, mentioned that it was well adapted to prevent friction in machinery and that when filtered through charcoal made a fairly satisfactory lamp fuel.

In 1840 Samuel M. Kier, a Pittsburgh druggist, began bottling and selling crude oil as a medicine for fifty cents per half pint. The expense of obtaining, bottling and peddling it absorbed most of the profits, so he attempted to improve it for lighting purposes. He went to a chemist, who suggested distillation. In 1849 he constructed a crude still consisting of a kettle with a cover and worm-cooling coil; by double distilling the oil he made a fairly satisfactory lamp fuel. The heavier product of distillation he sold to a factory in Coopers-town, Pa., for cleansing wools. This apparently was the first commercial petroleum refinery, and initiated the replacement of coal oil by kerosene⁷ as a lamp fuel.

The first scientific investigation of petroleum was made by Benjamin Silliman, Jr., at the request of George H. Bissell. His report, dated April 14, 1855, gave important information on the chemical and physical properties of Pennsylvania "rock oil," and pointed out its economic value. In December, 1854, Silliman wrote to Bissell and painted a bright picture of the commercial possibilities of the "rock oil," based on his findings to that date. On the basis of this letter George H. Bissell and Jonathan G. Eveleth organized the Pennsylvania Rock Oil Company (Dec. 30, 1854) for the expressed purpose of drilling or mining for oil. This company was

dissolved before a well was drilled, and Bissell and associates organized the Seneca Oil Company, which leased a plot of land on Oil Creek near Titusville, Pa. "Col." E. L. Drake, engaged to supervise the operations, hired two former brine-well drillers to drill the well, which was completed Aug. 28, 1859, at a depth of 69½ feet. The initial production was about 25 barrels per day, and during the remainder of the year the well produced approximately 2000 barrels of oil.

The Drake well marked the real beginning of the petroleum industry. News of its success soon spread, and Oil Creek Valley and the Allegheny River banks, above and below Oil City, were rapidly developed. For these early leases no rent was charged, a royalty of one eighth to one fourth of the oil produced being paid to the landowner. Many of these wells were drilled by the spring pole method, although even at that early date some were drilled with steam power, the rigs having all of the essentials of the present American standard cable tool-drilling rig. The first of many oil boom towns was Pithole⁷. From January to September, 1865, Pithole mushroomed from a population of less than 100 to an estimated 14,000. In September, 1865, its post office ranked next in importance to those of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. However, the production rapidly declined, the population shifted to other more active areas, and within two years the town was practically deserted. It is now one of many ghost towns⁷ scattered throughout the nation, for which the American petroleum industry is famous.

During the period of early development the principal methods of transporting crude oil were by teams and barges. In 1865, much to the chagrin and anger of the teamsters, who attempted to destroy it several times, the first successful screw joint pipe line was built from Pithole to a railroad, a distance of five miles. It had a capacity of eighty barrels per day. This line was later purchased by the Allegheny Transportation Company, the first pipe line company in the United States. In 1879 the first long-distance pipe line was completed by the Tidewater Pipeline Company. It extended from Coryville, Pa., to Williamsport, a distance of 102 miles. The National Transit Company constructed the first pipe line from the oil region in western Pennsylvania to the Atlantic seaboard. It was completed in 1881.

Since this early boom development in northwestern Pennsylvania the history of the American petroleum industry has been one of constant expansion in geographical distribution and quantity of production, in transportation systems, in

refining technology and marketing facilities. While Pennsylvania remained the principal source of supply for several years, small quantities of oil were produced in New York, Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee and California. After 1884 production in Ohio and West Virginia increased rapidly. In 1894 Wyoming came into the picture as a producing state. Near the turn of the century development was under way in Texas, Indian Territory (Oklahoma), Kansas, Louisiana and Illinois (see Midcontinent Oil Region). In 1904 California production was 30,000,000 barrels. About this time appreciable quantities began to come into the markets from Colorado and Indiana, and Kansas and Texas were being developed rapidly. Active development of New Mexico and Michigan began in 1924 and 1925 respectively.

At the present time (1939) oil is found and produced in twenty-three states at an average rate of 3,500,000 barrels per day. This production comes from 351,000 active oil wells, averaging 9.8 barrels per well per day. The largest producing well ever drilled was in the Yates pool, Pecos County, Tex., which produced 130,000 barrels in one day from a depth of 1280 feet. The deepest well in the world, which has been drilled to a depth of 15,003 feet, is in California. The United States alone produced 1,250,000,000 barrels of crude oil in 1937. The total oil produced in the United States from 1859 to Jan. 1, 1938, was 21,208,000,000 barrels or 64% of the total production of the entire world.

About 280,000 miles of pipe line, 154,000 railroad tank cars, 751 oil tankers and 40,000 tank trucks are now used solely for transporting American crude oil, natural gas and gasoline.

From the first simple still of Kier to the modern refineries is a far cry. Prior to 1900 the most important products of petroleum had been kerosene and lubricating oil. From this time forward many other petroleum products, such as naphthas, gasoline and fuel oil, became of economic value. In 1935 there were 638 modern refineries in the United States, with a daily capacity of more than 4,000,000 barrels. They produced over 300 base products from crude petroleum, from which thousands of finished products were manufactured. The American petroleum industry has a total investment of approximately \$15,000,000,000, and is the third largest in the country, being exceeded only by the agricultural and automotive industries.

Probably no other mineral resource has done more to change the lives of the American people than has oil. After the development of a satisfactory fuel the automobile age began; and in

numerous ways petroleum made possible and is necessary to the modern American civilization.

[P. H. Giddens, *The Birth of the Oil Industry, The Derrick's Handbook of Petroleum, A Complete Chronological and Statistical Review of Petroleum Developments from 1859 to 1899*, 2 vols., Oil City, 1895; A. R. Crum and A. S. Dunagan, *The Romance of American Petroleum and Gas; Petroleum Facts and Figures*, American Petroleum Institute.]

R. E. SHERRILL

Oil Scandals. See Elk Hills Oil Scandal; Teapot Dome Oil Scandal, Naval Oil Reserves.

Oise-Aisne Operation, American Troops in (Aug. 18–Nov. 11, 1918). Exploiting the success of the Aisne-Marne operation^o in reducing the Marne salient, Gen. Pétain ordered Degoutte's 6th French army and Mangin's 10th French army to continue their offensive between the Aisne and the Oise. The American 3rd Corps (Bullard) was in Degoutte's army east of Soissons when the attack was resumed, with the 77th Division (Duncan, Johnson, Alexander) and the 28th Division (Muir) in line, left to right, behind the Vesle. After indecisive fighting along this stream the two divisions crossed, Sept. 4, with the general French advance, and, against strong opposition by Von Boehn's 7th German army, pushed across the watershed toward the Aisne. The 28th Division was relieved Sept. 8, the 77th on Sept. 16, after progressing ten kilometers and crossing the Aisne Canal.

Placed in line in Mangin's army north of Soissons, the 32nd Division attacked toward Juvigny on Aug. 28. This place was taken Aug. 30, and on Sept. 2, after repeated attacks, the division reached the National Road at Tervy.

[Joseph M. Hanson, History of the American Combat Divisions, in *The Stars and Stripes*; J. J. Pershing, *My Experiences in the World War*.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Ojibwa. See Chippewa, The.

Okanagan, Fort, located on the right side of the Columbia River^o at the mouth of the Okanagan, was built by the Pacific Fur Company^o in 1811 as an Indian trading post. In 1813 it passed to the North West Fur Company, and in 1821 to the Hudson's Bay Company^o which claimed indemnity for it when the territory under dispute passed from Britain to the United States (see Oregon Question). Formerly of great importance as a trade route center, by 1860 it had almost disappeared.

[E. Voorhis, *Historic Forts and Trading Posts*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Okeechobee, The Battle of (Dec. 25, 1837), was the bloodiest engagement of the Second Seminole War^o. Regular and volunteer troops under Col. Zachary Taylor met Seminole^o and Mikasuki warriors in a swamp on the north shore of Lake Okeechobee, Fla. Taylor had the advantage of numbers, the Indians the advantage of position. Taylor attacked, sending Missouri volunteers across the swamp toward a hummock where the enemy waited. Exposed to a galling fire, many Missourians fell, regulars taking their places. After three hours Taylor, by a flank movement, drove the Indians before him. Twenty-six whites were killed, 112 were wounded. Indian losses were not determined accurately, but at least fourteen perished. Albeit without great immediate consequence, this conflict ultimately proved an important factor in effecting removal of the Indians from Florida. It also brought Taylor to the fore as a determined and courageous, if not brilliant, commander.

[J. T. Sprague, *The . . . Florida War.*]

HOLMAN HAMILTON

Oklahoma. The first Europeans to visit the region included in the present State of Oklahoma were a few Spanish soldiers under the leadership of Coronado^o who crossed it in 1541 seeking for the fabled land of Quivira. The expedition gave Spain a claim to this region, but no permanent settlements were made and the claim was lost to France by the explorations of Jolliet and LaSalle^o in the next century. By the Treaty of Fontainebleau^o France ceded her claims to the western half of the Mississippi Valley to Spain, but the latter retroceded it to France in 1800 by the Treaty of San Ildefonso^o. In 1803 France sold Louisiana, including all of Oklahoma except the Panhandle, to the United States. American explorers visited it during the years following the Louisiana Purchase, and in 1824 Col. Matthew Arbuckle founded Forts Gibson and Towson^o as the first military posts.

Few Indians were found by the early explorers except some Osage and small bands of Kiowa, Comanche^o and Wichita. During the period from 1820 to 1840, however, the Cherokee, Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw and Seminole^o were removed to Oklahoma from their former homes in the Gulf Plains region (*see* Indian Removal) and given all the land included in the present state except the Panhandle and a small area in the northeast assigned to the Quapaw tribe. Here these five great Indian nations, known as the Five Civilized Tribes, established little Indian republics, all except the Seminole having written constitutions and written laws. The Five Civil-

ized Tribes held slaves and joined the Confederacy during the Civil War. At the close of that struggle they were forced to give up the western part of their lands, constituting roughly the western half of the present state, as a home for other Indians. During the next few years some twenty tribes were located here upon thirteen reservations.

One area of about 2,000,000 acres near the center of the state was not included in any reservation. This came to be known as the "Unassigned Lands" or "Old Oklahoma." Efforts were made to settle this area by the so-called "boomers,"^o but they were removed by soldiers. On April 22, 1889, it was opened to white settlement in accordance with the terms of an act of Congress and a proclamation of the President of the United States. This opening was the first of the so-called "Oklahoma runs." In May, 1890, from these "Unassigned Lands" and the Panhandle (*see* Cimarron, Proposed Territory of), a region at this time outside the limits of any state or territory, the Territory of Oklahoma was created.

During the next sixteen years the remaining Indian lands west of the Indian Territory^o, as the country of the Five Civilized Tribes was called, were opened to white settlement and attached to Oklahoma Territory (*see* Cherokee Strip). Some were opened by "runs" (*see* Oklahoma Openings), the Kiowa-Comanche-Wichita reservation by lottery, and Greer County^o, claimed by Texas, was added by a decision of the Supreme Court. In the meantime the Five Civilized Tribes had continued to live under their own governments. Many white people came in to live among them, and a demand that these governments and the system of holding lands in common be abolished grew steadily stronger. In 1893 the Dawes Commission^o was created by the United States Government to achieve these objectives. After many years it was successful, and in 1906 Congress passed an Enabling Act permitting Oklahoma and Indian Territory to make a constitution for a new state which should include both regions. The convention, consisting of 112 delegates, met at Guthrie and formed a constitution, and Oklahoma became the forty-sixth state of the Union on Nov. 16, 1907.

Since statehood, Oklahoma has steadily grown in population and wealth. The outstanding features of the state are its great Indian population of about 120,000 from which many leaders of the state have been drawn, and the enormous production of petroleum. Oil^o production, which was just beginning in 1900, increased rapidly to 1924 when 500,000 barrels were produced in a single day. Such a vast output has brought great

wealth and has shaped and colored the entire economic and social life of the state.

[J. S. Buchanan and E. E. Dale, *A History of Oklahoma*; E. E. Dale and J. L. Rader, *Readings in Oklahoma History*; J. B. Thoburn and Muriel H. Wright, *Oklahoma—A History of the State and Its People*; Roy Guttinger, *The Formation of the State of Oklahoma*.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Oklahoma Openings. These were the opening of former Indian lands in western Oklahoma^o to white settlement. The first was that of the "Unassigned Lands" which, under the authority of an act of Congress, the President of the United States proclaimed would be open to settlement under the homestead^o laws of the United States at high noon, April 22, 1889. This resulted in a "run" in which some 50,000 people took part, each seeking to be the first to settle on one of the 160-acre homestead tracts. Other former Indian lands opened by "runs" were the Iowa, Sauk and Fox, and Shawnee Potawatomi reservations in 1891, the Cheyenne-Arapaho in 1892, the Cherokee Strip^o, Pawnee and Tonkawa in 1893, and the Kickapoo in 1895. In an effort to avoid the disorder incident to the "runs" the Kiowa-Comanche and Wichita lands were opened in 1901 by a lottery in which qualified homesteaders wanting lands registered and were allowed to choose homesteads in the order in which their names were drawn. In 1906 the so-called "Big Pasture Lands" were opened by an auction sale in which tracts of 160 acres were sold to the highest bidder, only qualified homesteaders being allowed to bid.

[J. S. Buchanan and E. E. Dale, *A History of Oklahoma*; E. E. Dale and J. L. Rader, *Readings in Oklahoma History*.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Oklahoma Squatters were settlers upon lands not yet opened to white settlement, or to which the title was in dispute. As early as 1819 white settlers attempted to occupy lands in the southeastern part of the present state that were claimed by the Osage, but were removed by the military. The region between the two branches of Red River, known as Greer County^o which was claimed by both Texas and the United States, was also entered by settlers soon after 1880 though a presidential proclamation warned them not to occupy it until the question of title had been settled.

During the period from 1879 to 1885 a large number of so-called "boomers,"^o under the leadership of C. C. Carpenter, David L. Payne and W. L. Couch, sought to settle as squatters upon the Unassigned Lands of central Oklahoma, but were removed by United States soldiers just

prior to each of the various openings of lands to settlement a number of people entered upon the land before the date set for the opening. These were known as "Sooners." Many other white persons entered the Indian Territory^o without the permission of the governments of the Five Civilized Tribes^o and stubbornly resisted removal. These were in reality squatters, though they were commonly called "intruders."

[J. S. Buchanan and E. E. Dale, *A History of Oklahoma*; E. E. Dale and J. L. Rader, *Readings in Oklahoma History*.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

"Old Abe." A nickname often applied to Abraham Lincoln, sometimes in affection, sometimes derisively. The term was in common use as early as 1858, although Lincoln was only forty-nine years of age at that time.

PAUL M. ANGLE

Old Age. Industrial superannuation has become an increasingly acute problem in the United States in consequence of the changing age distribution of the population. In 1870 those sixty-five years of age and over constituted 3% of the total population; in 1890 the percentage was 3.7; in 1920, 4.7; and in 1930, 5.4. It has been estimated that by 1975 those over sixty-five years of age will constitute 13% of the total population. The chief cause of the increased number of elderly persons in the population has been the decline in the birth rate, a factor that has automatically increased the proportion of the old. The more reliable life tables, on the other hand, do not indicate great increase in expectancy of life at the ages of from sixty to seventy.

Prior to the 1930's, pension and annuity plans covered only a small percentage of the population. In 1929, according to a compilation made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, some 550,751 persons were beneficiaries of both public and private pension and annuity plans, the average annual pension being \$519. While the movement for noncontributory state pensions hardly got under way before the 1920's (and only ten states had such legislation in 1929), depression conditions and establishment, in 1935 under the provisions of the Social Security Act^o, of Federal assistance to states having such plans, accelerated the movement and in 1937 plans approved for Federal assistance were in effect in forty-six states and three territories.

Except in making provision for superannuated public employees, the one departure in government provision from the noncontributory pension plan, prior to the Social Security Act of 1935, was the legislation enacted in 1934 and 1935 for railroad workers, which provided for payroll de-

ductions, employer contributions, and retirement at the age of sixty-five with annuities for life. Under the provisions of the Social Security Act, old-age insurance is extended to 37,000,000 workers, or approximately three fifths of those normally gainfully occupied. Benefits become payable at the age of sixty-five, and are based upon wages earned subsequent to Dec. 31, 1930.

[Paul H. Douglas, *Social Security in the United States*; M. S. Stewart, *Social Security*; A. Epstein, *Social Insurance*.]

ROYAL E. MONTGOMERY

Old Chillicothe (Indian Town). See Chillicothe.

Old Court-New Court Struggle, THE, was a political contest in Kentucky, which reached its climax 1824-26, and which involved the immunity of the state supreme court (called Court of Appeals) from legislative control and the finality of its decisions on constitutional questions. The controversy was engendered by the financial and business disturbances which eventuated in the Panic of 1819⁹ and which lingered on for nearly a decade, and by the efforts of the legislature to mitigate distress by passing measures of doubtful validity. The immediate cause of the clash was the action of the Appellate Court, October, 1823, in affirming, in the cases of *Blair v. Williams* and *Lapsley v. Brashears* (4 Littell 34, 46), the principle that stay laws unduly restricting the time for issuing executions on judgments and laws granting excessive indulgence to debtors upon replevin bonds, were violations of both state and Federal constitutions in that such hindrances and burdens upon the rights and remedies of creditors impaired the obligation of contracts⁹. In retaliation, the advocates of "Relief" for the large debtor class, who controlled the legislature, undertook in December, 1824, to abolish the Court of Appeals by passing a "reorganizing" act, repealing the law under which that court had been organized and setting up an entirely new court in its place. This act was promptly declared unconstitutional by the "Old Court," but in defiance of the adjudication the new appointees proceeded to organize a "New Court." The bench and bar of the state were divided in allegiance between the rival courts, which functioned simultaneously during the ensuing two years, but a majority of both judges and lawyers adhered to the "Old Court." An acrimonious contest between the two court parties engaged the attention of the people of the state preceding the elections of 1825 and 1826. The "Old Court" finally triumphed, and in December, 1826, an act was passed repealing the "re-

organizing" act of two years before. The objectives of the "New Court" party were not unlike those of many countries which, during and after the World War, and in the years of depression following the economic crash of 1929, sought by moratoriums⁹ and other devices to ease the hardships of debtors.

[Arndt M. Stickles, *The Critical Court Struggle in Kentucky, 1819-1829*; Samuel M. Wilson, *The Old Court and New Court Controversy in Kentucky*; Cassius M. Clay, Jr., *It Happened Before*.]

SAMUEL M. WILSON

"Old Dominion," THE. When Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660 his authority was promptly and enthusiastically recognized by the Virginia burgesses. Thereupon Charles elevated Virginia to the position of a "dominion" by quartering the arms of the old seal of the London Company⁹ on his royal shield along with the arms of England, Scotland and Ireland; and the burgesses, recalling that they were the oldest as well as the most loyal of the Stuart settlements in the New World, adopted the name, "The Old Dominion."

[John Fiske, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors*.]

JAMES E. WINSTON

Old Field Schools were quite common in parts of the Southern states before the Civil War. They acquired the name from the practice of schools being established at convenient places in the neighborhood, generally on a neglected or abandoned old field not suitable for farming. Most of them had only one teacher, generally a man, who was often indifferently trained. The curriculum usually consisted of the merest rudiments of learning. The schoolhouses were generally crude, as was also the equipment, and discipline was often quite rigid. Some of these schools, however, grew into rather pretentious institutions and went under the name of academies⁹.

[Edgar W. Knight, *Public Education in the South*.]

EDGAR W. KNIGHT

"Old Fuss and Feathers" was a nickname applied to Gen. Winfield Scott. The connotation was affectionate or derisive, depending on the user's opinion of Scott. The sobriquet referred to the general's love of military pageantry, show uniforms and meticulousness in military procedure and etiquette. Soldiers, who appreciated his talents, seldom used it maliciously.

CHARLES WINSLOW ELLIOTT

"Old Hickory." Because of his endurance and strength, this nickname was given to Andrew Jackson in 1813 by his soldiers during a march

from Natchez, Miss., to Nashville, Tenn. By this name he was affectionately known among his friends and followers for the rest of his life.

[J. S. Bassett, *Life of Andrew Jackson*, J. Parton, *Life of Andrew Jackson*.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Old Ironsides. See *Constitution*, The

Old Northwest, THE, included some 248,000 square miles, approximately between the Ohio, the Mississippi and the Great Lakes. The Definitive Treaty of Peace of 1783 awarded this territory to the United States, and, after the different states had ceded their claims (see *Western Lands*), it became a public domain which was organized as the Northwest Territory⁹⁹.

[F. A. Ogg, *The Old Northwest*]

BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

"Old Oaken Bucket," THE. One version as to the inception of this poem has it that Samuel Woodworth, journalist, playwright and poet, upon drinking a glass of water at home one day in 1817, remarked, "How much more refreshing it would be to drink from the old oaken bucket hanging in my father's well"; upon which his wife remarked, "That's a splendid idea for a poem." The other version is that when Woodworth once praised some brandy at a bar, the saloonkeeper, an old friend, reminded him how much better the water once tasted from the old well bucket they knew in childhood, whereupon Woodworth immediately wrote the poem. It was taken into the McGuffey readers⁹⁹, and was set to music by Frederick Smith, who merely adapted a tune composed by George Kiallmark for Thomas Moore's "Araby's Daughter." To this air it became one of the most popular of our nostalgic songs of home during the 19th century.

[*Poetical Works of Samuel Woodworth*, edited by his son, F. A. Woodworth; Louis R. Dressler, *Favorite Masterpieces*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

"Old Rough and Ready." His physical prowess and zeal and the informality of his military attire earned this sobriquet for Gen. Zachary Taylor during the Seminole War⁹⁹ in 1841. The nickname was of great service to him in winning votes when he was a candidate for the Presidency in 1848.

[Joseph Reese Fry, *Life of General Zachary Taylor*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Old Settlers Associations. When people became conscious of the tremendous change wrought by the frontier⁹⁹ process within the memories of their oldest citizens they organized Pio-

neer Clubs or Old Settlers Associations to honor the past before it should entirely escape them. Thus, Jefferson and Wayne counties in Indiana, both organized in 1811, held their first Old Settlers meetings in 1852 and 1854. This interval of forty years marked the time required to effect a transition from frontier to settled agricultural community. Old Settlers Day, an annual fall holiday, is celebrated in many county seats, not only by members but by the people of the community generally. Some Old Settlers Associations function as local historical societies, among which are those of Oswego County, N. Y.; Lake County, Ind.; Sauk County, Wis., and Hennepin County, Minn. They are more prevalent in the North and West than in the South and East.

[Many of the Old Settlers Associations publish their proceedings.]

HARVEY L. CARTER

Old South Church, Boston, was built in 1729 to replace the original structure of 1670. Here was held the Boston Massacre⁹⁹ town meeting which forced the royal governor to withdraw the British troops from Boston in 1770; here were delivered Massacre anniversary orations by Warren, Hancock and others, and here was held the Tea Party⁹⁹ meeting from which the "Indians" went to dump the hated tea into Boston Harbor.

[H. A. Hall, *History of the Old South Church*; S. A. Drake, *Old Landmarks and Historic Personages of Boston*.]

R. W. G. VAIL

Old Style. See *Calendar*, The

Oleana, an immigrant colony in northern Pennsylvania, was established in 1852 by the Norwegian violinist, Ole Bull, who bought 120,000 acres of land in Potter County and planned a "New Norway." Immigrants began to arrive in September and the village of Oleana was founded. Poor management and unfavorable land and market conditions, coupled with brazen frauds practised upon the founder by land sharpers, brought about the quick collapse of the colony. An ironical Norwegian ballad (1853) described Oleana as a land where "cakes rain down from out the skies," Munchener beer runs in the creeks, everybody plays the fiddle,

And little roasted piggies, with manners quite demure, Sir,

They ask you, "Will you have some ham?"—and then you say, "Why, sure, Sir."

Ole-Ole-Ole, oh, Oleana!

[T. C. Blegen, *Norwegian Migration to America, 1825-1860*; Blegen and Ruud, *Norwegian Emigrant Songs and Ballads*.]

T. C. BLEGEN

Olentangy, Battle of the (June 6, 1782). Near a fork of the Olentangy, a few miles from present Bucyrus, Ohio, the retreating frontier militia of the Crawford expedition⁹⁰ fought off the pursuing Indians and British Rangers. Three Americans were killed and eight wounded. This success saved the little army, then commanded by Col. David Williamson in place of the missing Col. William Crawford.

[E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, *History of Ohio*, Vol. II.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

"Olive Branch Petition." After the first armed clashes at Lexington and Bunker Hill in 1775, the newly organized Continental Congress⁹¹ decided to send a petition to George III, setting forth the grievances of the colonies. Knowing the king's violent opposition to the idea of dealing with the colonies as an united group, the congressional delegates each signed the paper as an individual. Further to show their amicable intent, Richard Penn, descendant of William Penn and a staunch loyalist, was made their messenger. But when Penn reached London on Aug. 14, 1775, the king refused to see him or to receive his petition through any channel.

[John Fiske, *The American Revolution*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Olmstead Case. See Wire Tapping Cases.

Olney Corollary of Monroe Doctrine. In his dispatch of July 20, 1895, to Thomas F. Bayard, Ambassador to Great Britain, Secretary of State Richard Olney applied the Monroe Doctrine⁹² to the Venezuelan situation by a much broader interpretation than that previously current. He declared that the Doctrine as a part of "public law" had made it the traditional policy of the United States to oppose a forcible increase by any European power of its territorial possessions in the Americas; that by withholding from arbitration part of the territory in dispute with Venezuela⁹³, Great Britain was constructively extending its colonization; and that since the United States was "entitled to resent and resist any sequestration of Venezuelan soil by Great Britain, it is necessarily entitled to know whether such sequestration has occurred or is now going on." On the basis of this extension of the Doctrine, Cleveland in December asked Congress to appoint a commission to fix the true boundary, beyond which Britain should not be allowed to push. Olney's loose construction of the Doctrine went much beyond the language used by Monroe and Adams, and was at once challenged by various American authorities on the subject.

[Henry James, *Richard Olney and His Public Services*; A. L. P. Dennis, *Adventures in American Diplomacy, 1896-1906*.]

ALLAN NEVINS

Olney-Pauncefote Treaty, THE, was a general treaty of Anglo-American arbitration drafted primarily by Secretary of State Richard Olney and Sir Julian Pauncefote, British minister to the United States. Such a treaty had been considered for some years, and was suggested anew by Lord Salisbury in January, 1896. Salisbury proposed one of limited terms; Olney believed in giving arbitration the greatest possible scope, and in making the awards securely binding. The treaty he and Pauncefote drew up during 1896 made pecuniary and most other nonterritorial disputes completely arbitrable; territorial disputes, and any "disputed questions of principle of grave importance," were arbitrable subject to an appeal to a court of six, and if more than one of the six dissented, the award was not to be binding. Parliament promptly ratified the treaty. Cleveland sent it to the Senate on Jan. 11, 1897, with his strong approval, but it lay over until the Republican administration came into office. Then, although McKinley and Secretary John Hay earnestly supported it, ratification failed.

[Henry James, *Richard Olney and His Public Services*; R. B. Mowat, *Life of Lord Pauncefote*.]

ALLAN NEVINS

Olustee, Battle of (Feb. 20, 1864), between 5500 Federal troops, under Gen. Truman Seymour, and 5200 Confederates, under Gen. Joseph Finnegan, resulted in a Confederate victory and thwarted the Union purpose of gaining possession of the interior of Florida. Losses in killed, wounded and missing were: Federal, 1861; Confederate, 946.

[William Watson Davis, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Florida*; Caroline Mays Brevard and H. E. Bennett, *History and Government of Florida*.]

W. T. CASH

Olympic Games, THE, were revived in Athens in 1896 with the United States informally represented by a group of athletes which won no less than nine out of the fourteen field and track events. The meet was not properly organized to permit of real championship competition, however, and it neither attracted representative entries from the world of sport nor awoke much public attention. Little more can be said for the second games, held in Paris in 1900, or for those staged in St. Louis in 1904, the latter drawing few athletes from outside of the United States. It was the more carefully organized Olympiad held in London four years later, with a total

of some 2500 entries, which marked the really successful institution of the modern Olympic Games.

While the United Kingdom won a total of more first prizes than any other nation in 1908, the United States maintained that supremacy in field and track events, far and away the most important division of Olympic sports, which it had first asserted in 1896. It has done so ever since. One of its greatest teams was that which went to the Stockholm games in 1912, including the famous James Thorpe. With the renewal of the Olympiads after the interruption of the World War, its track and field athletes were acknowledged victors at each successive four-year meeting. In 1924 and 1928 they were hard pressed by the great long-distance runners of Finland, and there has been increasing competition in some other events, but American track and field supremacy has become an accepted feature of the games.

Occasional controversy and unfortunate incidents on the field of competition have served at times to mar the spirit of international good will which the Olympic Games have been supposed to foster, but there can be little question of their influence in promoting sport throughout the world, and in stimulating an interest in athletics among nations which had heretofore paid slight attention to them.

[F. A. M. Webster, *The Evolution of the Olympic Games.*]

FOSTER RHEA DULLES

Omnibus Bill, THE (1850), was reported on May 8 by the special Senate Committee of Thirteenrd. It was an attempt at a comprehensive adjustment of the territorial question. On June 17 the "popular sovereignty"th feature was applied to the provisions concerning Utah. The opposition of President Taylor and of the Northern and Southern opponents of compromise prevented the adoption of the bill even by the Senate. In the contemporary figure of speech the "omnibus" experienced such rough going that it jolted out all of its occupants but one. On July 31 the sections relating to California, New Mexico and Texas were stricken out and on the following day the Senate adopted the Utah bill. Later legislation (*see* Compromise of 1850) included substantially the ground of the originally proposed compromise.

ARTHUR C. COLE

"On to Richmond." On June 28, 1861, an editorial—reputedly written by Charles A. Dana, but really by another staff writer—entitled "Forward to Richmond," appeared in the *New York Tribune*. Other newspapers took up the phrase,

shortening it to "On to Richmond," and it actually influenced Federal military policy.

[James Harrison Wilson, *Life of Charles A. Dana.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

"On to Washington." When the Federal Army was fleeing from the field of Bull Runth, July 21, 1861, this cry was raised among the pursuing Confederate troops, but they themselves became too disorganized at the moment to achieve the objective. Newspapers all over the South then took up the phrase and urged it repeatedly.

[Jefferson Davis, *Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

"Onas," the name applied in the early 18th century by the Indians, especially the Six Nationsth, to the governor of Pennsylvania. The governor of Canada was "Onontio"th; of New York, "Corlear", of Virginia, "Assarigoa"; of Maryland, "Tocarryhogan."

[Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Vol. I.]

JAMES ELLIOTT WALMSLEY

Oñate's Explorations (1598–1608) were in reality rediscoveries of regions previously seen by Coronadoth, Espejo and Humaña, but they brought to light better trails and established Spain on the Rio Grande. Juan de Oñate, who previously had colonized San Luis Potosi, was appointed in 1595 to colonize and govern a new Mexico to be founded on the Rio Grande. He advanced from the Mexican frontier with 400 men, of whom 130 had families, and took formal possession near El Paso on April 30, 1598. Later in the summer he founded San Juan, north of the present Santa Féth. In the next three years he and his subordinates explored and subjugated the present New Mexicoth and northeastern Arizona. Oñate's first extensive journey from the Rio Grande was eastward in 1601, down the Canadian River and northeastward to the grass-house Indian village of Quiverath, which Bolton locates on the Arkansas in the present Kansas. Returning to New Mexico, Oñate suppressed a brewing revolt. Late in 1604 he marched westward across the present northern Arizona to Bill Williams Fork, followed it to the Colorado River, and marched down that stream to the Gulf of California, returning in 1605. He was recalled from the governorship in 1608.

[Herbert E. Bolton, *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest.*]

BLISS ISELY

One Big Union, as a radical development, chiefly appeared in the Industrial Workers of the Worldth, organized at Chicago in 1905. The

term "one big union" may also be applied to the Knights of Labor[™] (1869) which aimed at an inclusive membership. The Knights did not espouse class struggle, whereas the I. W. W., working for One Big Union, irrespective of craft, color or wage, were anarcho-sindicalist in philosophy. Contributing in part to the make-up of the I. W. W. was also the American Labor Union organized in 1902 which grew out of the Western Labor Union organized in 1898. Each of these presumably aimed at a general labor organization. The I. W. W. split into factions in 1908, of which the Chicago group was the more prominent and revolutionary. Criminal syndicalist[™] laws of the World-War period contributed to its decline.

[G. G. Groat, *Organized Labor in America*, N. S. Ware, *Labor in Modern Industrial Society*.]

HERBERT MAYNARD DIAMOND

Oneida, THE, was one of the smaller confederated Iroquois[™] tribes situated south of Oneida Lake where a few survivors still linger. Their original number was scarcely over 1200, but at the present time some 3200 are reported. They served the patriot cause in the American Revolution and were recognized in the Fort Stanwix Treaty of 1784[™].

[William M. Beauchamp, *History of the Iroquois*; F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*.]

ARTHUR C. PARKER

Oneida Colony, THE, was America's most radical experiment in social and religious thinking. From literal concepts of Perfectionism[™] and Bible Communism the colony advanced into new forms of social relationship: economic communism, the rejection of monogamy for "complex marriage," the practice of an elementary form of birth control (*coitus reservatus*), and the eugenic breeding of "stirpicultural" children. John Humphrey Noyes, leader of the group, was a capable and shrewd Yankee whose sincere primitive Christianity expressed itself in radically modern terms. His fellow workers had experienced complete religious conversion and boldly followed him into a communal life which rejected the evils of competitive economics while it kept realistically to the methods of modern industry, believing that socialism is ahead of and not behind society.

From the inception of the colony in 1848 the property grew to about 600 acres of well-cultivated land, shoe, tailoring and machine shops, canning and silk factories, great central buildings, houses for employees and a branch colony in Wallingford, Conn. Assets were \$550,000 when communism was dropped. Health was above the average, women held a high place,

children were excellently trained, work was fair and changeable, and entertainment was constant. They made communism work by adapting social theory to native facts and background.

In 1879, forced by social pressure from without and the dissatisfaction of the young within, monogamy was adopted, and within a year communism was replaced by joint stock ownership. In the new form, Oneida has continued its commercial success, but as a conventional group.

[J. H. Noyes, *History of American Socialism*; W. A. Hinds, *American Communities*; R. A. Parker, *A Yankee Saint*.]

ALLAN MACDONALD

Onion River Land Company. A survey by Ira Allen in 1772 of the land in the New Hampshire Grants[™] convinced him of the value of the region around the Onion River (now the Winooksi) and the shores of Lake Champlain. In 1773 four Allen brothers, with a cousin, formed the company, and bought land from claimants under New Hampshire titles, securing certainly about 77,000 acres and possibly much more, perhaps as individuals. The venture was a pure land speculation, since they had full knowledge of the disputed title. Ethan Allen managed the sales and "political affairs," while Ira laid out a road and selected the site of Burlington. Settlement began at once, but financial success depended on destroying the New York claims, and to do this the Allens resorted to mob violence and the destruction of property, building forts and using the Green Mountain Boys[™], of whom Ethan Allen was colonel. New York outlawed them, but was ceasing to claim jurisdiction as the Revolution broke out. Around 16,000 acres were sold by 1775. After Ethan's death the affairs of the company became involved, and the only survivor, Ira, was reduced to poverty. The partners benefited little financially, but their interest in making good their titles was important for the early history and independence of Vermont.

[John Pell, *Ethan Allen*; J. B. Wilbur, *Ira Allen, Founder of Vermont*.]

HERBERT W. HILL

Onions, apparently natives of Asia, were unknown to the American Indian, and were first brought to this country from Europe by the early colonists. Wethersfield, Conn., soon became a noted onion-growing center. Barnstable, Mass., was a slightly less famous onion producer. Records show Wethersfield shipping onions as early as 1710, and a century later it was sending out a million bunches annually, many going to the West Indies. It supplied quantities of onions to the army and navy during the Revolutionary

War. But as onion culture spread to all parts of the country, Wethersfield lost its pre-eminence. Extensive production of Bermuda onions began soon after 1900 in Texas, California and Louisiana. In 1930 onions were the third truck crop in importance in the United States, though we were still importing them from Spain and Egypt.

[Norris Galpin Osborn, *History of Connecticut*; Percy Wells Bidwell, *Rural Economy in New England*, in *Transactions of Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, Vol. XX.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Onondaga, Great Council House at. The capital of the Five (Six) Nations Confederacy was in the domain of the Onondaga nation situated (ca. 1600) south of Onondaga Lake. The group may or may not have had an official council house at the capital town, Onondaga, but it was presumably not possible for the meetings of the Iroquois Confederacy^m to be held within a single building unless strictly limited to the civil chiefs and their attendants. The term "great council house" is used in a symbolic sense, as is also the expression "the unquenched brands of the Great Council Fire of the League." In 1743 John Bartram described the Onondaga Long House giving a ground plan showing the building to have been eighty feet long and seventeen feet wide.

[Lewis H. Morgan, *Houses and House Life of the American Aborigines*.]

ARTHUR C. PARKER

"Onontio," meaning Great Mountain, was the Iroquois name for the French governors of Canada. It was a translation of the surname of Charles Huault deMontmagny, who succeeded Champlain as governor of New France^m in 1636. In 1645 Montmagny called a grand council at the mission settlement of Sillery to consider the fate of two Iroquois prisoners. As a matter of policy their lives were spared, and one of the prisoners in a speech expressing his gratitude addressed Montmagny as "Onontio," thus it is said using this term for the first time.

[F. Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America*.]

A. C. FLICK

Ontario, Lake. This, the smallest of the five Great Lakes^m, was discovered by Samuel de Champlain and Etienne Brûlé in 1615. Champlain with a party of Hurons^m had traveled diagonally across Ontario from Lake Simcoe to the eastern end of the lake, somewhere in the neighborhood of Kingston, on his way to attack the Iroquois^m in what is now northern New York. Brûlé's course is more problematical, but he seems to have gone south from Lake Simcoe,

and to have reached Lake Ontario at Toronto. The lake appears as "Lac St Louis" on Champlain's map of 1632; as "Ontario ou Lac St Louis" on the Sanson map of 1656, as "Ontario" on Delisle's map of 1700. Popple has "Lake Ontario or Frontenac" in his 1733 map, but thereafter the name settled as Ontario. The name means "high rocks near the water." The lake was the scene of naval or military engagements between 1756 and 1759 and again in 1813; and for many generations it formed part of one of the principal water thoroughfares of the fur trade^m. Fort Frontenac^m was built in 1673, by the engineer Raudin, where the city of Kingston now stands. It was destroyed by Denonville in 1689, rebuilt by Frontenac in 1695, and captured and destroyed by the English in 1758. Kingston was founded in 1783 by United Empire Loyalists^m. Fort Toronto was built in 1750, where the city of the same name stands today, but there was a trading post here before 1730. Fort Oswego^m, built by Gov. Burnet of New York in 1727, was destroyed by Montcalm in 1756, rebuilt by Haldimand in 1759 and renamed Fort Ontario. In 1678 LaSalle^m built a small post at the mouth of the Niagara River, which was burnt in 1680, and rebuilt in stone by Chaussegros de Léry in 1726. Fort Niagara^m went through many vicissitudes, and finally was surrendered by the English to the United States in 1796 (see *Border Forts, The Evacuation of*). The first sailing ships on Lake Ontario, or on any of the Great Lakes, were four built by LaSalle at Fort Frontenac in 1678 or earlier, to provide transport between that place and his post at the mouth of the Niagara. From these little craft of ten tons have developed the gigantic lake freighters of today.

[George A. Cuthbertson, *Freshwater*.]

LAWRENCE J. BURPEE

Open Covenants, Openly Arrived at. The first of President Wilson's famous Fourteen Points^m included in his address to Congress of Jan. 8, 1918, read: "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view."

This proposal was concordant with the then popular slogan, "no secret treaties," although more far-reaching. In a letter to Secretary of State Lansing (March 12, 1918) President Wilson wrote ". . . certainly when I pronounced for open diplomacy I meant, not that there should be no private discussion of delicate matters, but that no secret agreements of any sort should be entered into, and that all interna-

tional relations when fixed should be open, above-board, and explicit."

The point for open diplomacy was a basis for Article 18 of the Covenant of the League of Nations⁷⁰, which provides for the registration and publication of treaties and that no treaty or international engagement shall be binding until registered.

HUNTER MILLER

Open-Door Policy, THE. The expression "open-door policy" made its appearance toward the end of the 19th century in connection with official efforts to ensure equality of opportunity and treatment—that is, to prevent discrimination—in the field of trade in certain parts of the world where there were keen political and commercial rivalries.

In the General Act of the Conference of Berlin, in 1885, there was made provision that the commerce of all nations should enjoy in the basin of the Congo and its tributaries equality of access, and that there should be in those regions no discrimination in official treatment either of ships or of goods. Thereafter the expression "open door" came into popular usage in connection with discussion of competition and policies in the Far East⁷¹, and especially of desiderata in regard to China. Ultimately that expression became particularized, especially in the United States, in reference to principles and procedure proposed by the American Secretary of State, John Hay, in the years 1899 and 1900, to the governments of the great powers most concerned, with the objective of preventing discrimination in the treatment of trade with and in China⁷². Toward his objective, Hay, taking full cognizance of the *status quo*, first (in 1899) gave and asked for a pledge of equality of treatment for commerce in the various "spheres of interest or influence" in China, and then (in 1900, while the Boxers⁷³ were besieging the legations) declared to the governments of the great powers represented in China that "the policy of the Government of the United States is to seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China, preserve China's territorial and administrative entity, protect all rights granted to friendly powers by treaty and international law, and safeguard for the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all parts of the Chinese Empire." (Circular Note, July 3, 1900, to "powers co-operating in China.")

In its broad application, "open-door policy" is an abbreviated and popular rendering of "policy of equality of commercial opportunity"—opportunity being envisaged in that connection from point of view of treatment officially

accorded. It has frequently been affirmed that this expression is accurately descriptive of the practice of most-favored-nation⁷⁴ treatment. In relations with China, the British government in 1842 and 1843 and the American Government in 1844 (*see* Cushing's Treaty) induced the Chinese government to enter into treaties, and China then and therein undertook to accord that treatment. The United States had before and has since, in its relations with all countries, asked always for equality of commercial opportunity (treatment). The principle underlying the "open-door policy" has been regarded in American opinion as the most equitable and the most practicable that can be applied toward guidance of international conduct in the commercial field. The American people have come to believe that practical application of that principle makes for stability and peace, and the American Government has consistently urged universal adoption of and adherence to it.

An outstanding official expression of a widely accepted concept of the "open door" was embodied in the Nine-Power Treaty negotiated at the Washington Conference in 1921-22⁷⁵. In that treaty the contracting powers other than China—agreeing at the outset "to respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China"—made provision, among themselves and in agreement with China, for equality of treatment for commerce and industry in China. At the eighteenth session of the committee of the Conference on Pacific and Far Eastern Questions, Mr. Balfour, of the British delegation, expressed the view that the "old practice of spheres of influence" had not only gone but had gone forever.

In simplest terms, the "open-door policy" is a policy directed toward regulation of competition in trade on the principle of fair play and without discrimination. This concept was well expressed by Secretary of State Charles E. Hughes, in an address delivered in 1922, in words as follows: ". . . We are not seeking special privileges anywhere at the expense of others. We wish to protect the just and equal rights of Americans everywhere in the world. We wish to maintain equality of commercial opportunity; as we call it, the Open Door." (Charles E. Hughes, in address at Cleveland, Nov. 4, 1922, *Bulletin of Pan American Union*, Vol. 56, page 13, 1923.)

[Tyler Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia*; B. Gerig, *The Open Door and the Mandates System*; Stanley K. Hornbeck, *Contemporary Politics in the Far East*, and Principles and Policies in Regard to China, *Foreign Affairs*, December, 1922; W. W. Willoughby, *Foreign Rights and Interests in China*.] STANLEY K. HORNBECK

Open Market Operations were not practised in this country until the passage of the Federal Reserve Act of Dec. 23, 1913. This act permitted Federal Reserve banks to buy and sell in the open market gold coin and bullion, United States Government securities, certain other specified public obligations, and bills of exchange of the type made eligible for rediscount. These original provisions have since been broadened to include a few other government-guaranteed and quasi-public securities.

Open market operations in practice have been confined largely to dealings in government direct obligations and bankers' acceptances. Both are important. Federal Reserve policy⁹⁹ regarding purchases of acceptances has greatly assisted the development of the acceptance market, while dealings in government securities have come to be considered the most potent factor in the control of credit, since purchases pump funds into the money market and sales withdraw them.

[F. A. Bradford, *Money and Banking*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Open Range Cattle Period. While cattle were pastured upon unoccupied public lands quite early and especially in Texas in the years before the Civil War, the period of open-range grazing, in a larger sense, began about 1866 and closed early in the last decade of the 19th century. During the years following the close of the Civil War a vast stream of cattle poured north out of Texas to cow towns⁹⁹ in Kansas and Nebraska. From these the fat, mature animals were shipped to market while young steers and breeding animals were driven farther north or west to stock new ranges. It has been estimated that nearly 5,500,000 cattle were driven north from Texas in the period from 1866 to 1885 and this does not include large numbers driven west or northwest into New Mexico and Colorado (*see Cattle Drives*).

Most of these cattle driven north each year were spread out over ranges in the public domain⁹⁹ throughout western Kansas, Nebraska, Dakota, Montana, Wyoming and other western states and territories. Here they were held for growth and fattening, the boundaries of each ranchman's pasture lands being determined by that unwritten law of the range known as "cow custom."⁹⁹ A ranch headquarters was usually established near the center of the range and along its borders were placed "cow camps" at which riders were stationed to look after the cattle and keep them within the limits of their own range. In spite of their efforts, however, some would stray across the line onto the pasture lands

of neighboring ranchmen which made it necessary to hold roundups⁹⁹ each spring and autumn. At the spring roundup calves were branded (*see Cattle Brands*) and at the fall roundup the fat, mature animals of each ranchman were separated from the remainder and placed in the "beef herd" to be shipped to market for slaughter.

The roundups were participated in by all the ranchmen of a large area designated as the "roundup district." Each usually sent a wagon and several cowboys to share in the work. In some states or territories, notably Wyoming, the districts and the dates and manner of conducting roundups were designated by law. A "roundup foreman" was chosen to have charge of the work and the method of disposing of "mavericks,"⁹⁹ or unbranded animals, was often fixed by statute.

As cattle were driven northward from Texas and spread over the public domain of the central and northern Plains they also spread over the state lands of western Texas and the great Indian reservations of the Indian Territory as well as those farther north. All of this great region constituted the so-called "cow country."⁹⁹ Settlers were steadily advancing westward along its eastern border and taking up homesteads⁹⁹, but the area lost to grazing was for a time compensated for by building dams across ravines and drilling deep wells from which water was pumped by windmills⁹⁹, thus opening up large tracts of hitherto unwatered lands to pasturage.

In 1875 began the first shipments of dressed beef to Europe which steadily increased until more than 50,000,000 pounds were exported in 1878, and over 100,000,000 pounds in 1881. Most of this was sent to Great Britain, and this enormous influx of American beef so alarmed the cattle growers of North Britain that a parliamentary commission was sent to this country to visit the range area and report upon conditions. Its report made in 1884 told of such great profits made in ranching as to cause much excitement among the English and Scottish investors and huge sums of British capital were sent to America for investment in ranching enterprises. Many individual Scots or English came to the cow country to give their personal attention to ranching, and the excitement extended even to the continent of Europe. By 1884 it was estimated that more than \$30,000,000 of British capital had been invested in ranching on the Great Plains.

Among the large Scottish or English enterprises were the Prairie Land and Cattle Company, the Matador, the Espuela Land and Cat-

tle Company and scores of others. An enthusiasm for grazing cattle upon the open range amounting almost to a craze had also swept over the United States before 1885. Prominent lawyers, United States senators, bankers and other businessmen throughout the East formed cattle companies to take advantage of the opportunities offered for ranching upon the great open ranges of the West. The destruction of the buffalo^o herds made it necessary to feed the many large tribes of Western Indians and this resulted in the awarding of valuable beef contracts for that purpose with the privilege of pasturing herds upon the various reservations.

The invention of barbed wire^o and the rapid extension of its use after 1875 brought about the inclosure of considerable tracts of pasture land. Laws were enacted by Congress, however, forbidding the fencing of lands of the public domain and orders of the Indian Bureau prohibited the inclosure of lands on Indian reservations^o. While such laws and orders were not strictly enforced, yet they were not without effect.

Perhaps the year 1885 marks the peak of the open-range cattle industry. By that time most of the range was fully stocked and much of it overstocked. During the summer of 1886 large herds were driven north from Texas and spread over the ranges in the most reckless fashion possible. Then came the terrible winter of 1886-87 (*see* Blizzards) in which hundreds of thousands of cattle died of cold and starvation. Spring came to find nearly every ranchman on the Central and Northern Plains facing ruin. The open-range cattle industry never recovered from the results of this tragic winter. The range area was being rapidly settled by homesteaders. Large Indian reservations were thrown open to settlement. The use of barbed wire was becoming universal and the public domain was passing into the hands of private owners who inclosed their lands with wire fences. In many regions cattle were being replaced by sheep^o. No date can be given as the end of the open-range cattle period, but by 1890 it was close at hand and by the end of the century that period virtually belonged to the past.

[E. E. Dale, *The Range Cattle Industry*; E. S. Osgood, *The Day of the Cattleman*; Joseph Nimmo, *The Range and Ranch Cattle Business of the United States*; John Clay, *My Life on the Range*; Louis Pelzer, *The Cattleman's Frontier*.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Open Shop. *See* Closed Shop.

Opera. The first opera known to have been performed in the United States was *Flora; or Hob in the Well*, produced at Charleston, S. C.,

Feb. 18, 1735. Opera performances began at New Orleans in 1790, and after 1813 a permanent company functioned regularly for a century. Opera in Eastern cities in the 19th century was less frequent. In the early years, dramatic stock companies occasionally varied their programs by staging an opera such as *The Barber of Seville*, regardless of the fact that they were not finished singers; or they merely recited the lines of an opera to orchestral accompaniment, as was done with *Der Freischutz* in New York in 1825. New York had a season of opera in 1825-26 with a foreign company headed by Mme. Malibran, and other touring companies visited America at intervals. A house intended exclusively for Italian opera opened in New York in 1833, and the Astor Place Opera House, completed in 1847, was intended as a temple of opera, but both were failures, and had to be given over to plays. *Leonora*, the first known opera composed by an American, W. H. Fry, was produced in Philadelphia in 1845. Adelina Patti made her debut in New York, her home city, in *Lucia di Lammermoor* in 1859. In the last quarter of the century, touring companies headed by American singers such as Clara Louise Kellogg and Emma Abbott brought opera to the cities from coast to coast. Walter Damrosch produced his first opera composition, *The Scarlet Letter*, with his own company in 1896. Meanwhile, stock companies here and there sang not only grand opera but the lighter sort then being composed by Offenbach, Strauss, Von Suppe, etc. By 1900 American composers of light opera such as Reginald DeKoven and Victor Herbert were producing works of some merit. The Castle Square Opera Company, organized by Henry W. Savage in 1894 to present light opera, had by 1900 grown into two organizations, the second one devoted to grand opera; it was the first to sing *Parsifal* in the United States. After its passing, the San Carlo Opera Company filled its place acceptably for several years. The Metropolitan Opera in New York was in 1938 the oldest and the only continuing repertory company in America. Boston had its own opera company from 1909 to 1913, and Chicago from 1917 to 1935. Oscar Hammerstein produced opera on a large scale in New York from 1906 to 1910, selling out in the last-named year to the Metropolitan for \$2,000,000.

[O. G. Sonneck, *Early Opera in America*; Louis C. Elson, *The History of American Music*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Opium Conferences. THE Narcotics which have been the subject of international conferences are

opium, coca leaves and marihuana (*cannabis*), their salts and derivatives and preparations made therefrom. Opium poppies and the coca plant are not grown in the United States, all supplies being imported under strictly enforced restrictions imposed under the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act⁷⁰. Recognizing the seriousness of the smuggling problem, and realizing that isolated action by one country can have no permanent or effective result while other countries allow full import and export of narcotics, the United States took the initiative in bringing about the first international conference on the subject of narcotic drugs, which was held at Shanghai in 1909, and has participated in all of the international conferences on the subject held since that date. The American Government took part in the international opium conferences held at The Hague in 1912, in 1913 and in 1914, participated in the Second Geneva Drug Conference of 1924-25, and in the Narcotics Limitation Conference of 1931, and was represented by an observer at the Bangkok Conference of 1931 on Opium Smoking in the Far East. As a result of these international conferences, there are in force three treaties, the latter two of which supplement and reinforce the first. These three treaties are The Hague Opium Convention of 1912, the Geneva Drug Convention of 1925 and the Narcotics Limitation Convention of 1931. The United States is a party to the first and last, but is not a party to the Geneva Drug Convention of 1925. Nevertheless, by ratifying the Narcotics Limitation Convention of 1931, the United States has bound itself to observe certain of the more important and valuable stipulations of the 1925 convention. The advantage of this 1931 convention to the United States lies in the fact that it limits the quantities of dangerous drugs manufactured in other countries, renders much stricter the control abroad of the legitimate trade in these substances, and affords better facilities for combating the illicit traffic, from which the United States is today one of the principal sufferers.

[Reports published annually by the Government of the United States on the *Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs*.]

WILL S. WOOD

Opium Trade. The United States, in which country the opium poppy is not grown, has no history of opium trade comparable to that of the poppy-producing countries, which have derived considerable revenue from their dealings in this drug. A review of statistics for the period between the years 1860 and 1915 shows that imports of opium into this country during that

time increased in far greater proportion than was warranted by the increase in population. Congress took cognizance of this condition, and in 1909 prohibited the importation of smoking opium or opium prepared for smoking. On May 26, 1922, previously enacted legislation was materially strengthened by the passage of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act⁷¹. By virtue of this act as amended, the Government allows, under a system of carefully regulated permits, the importation of such amounts of crude opium as the Commissioner of Narcotics finds necessary to provide for the medical and legitimate uses of the country, it being unlawful, however, to import crude opium for the purpose of manufacturing heroin. No manufactured form of opium may be imported. Importers of crude opium generally use the entire supply obtained by importation for their own manufacture, with only occasional sales of small quantities to pharmaceutical manufacturers for making tinctures and extracts. Most of the crude opium is imported into the United States from England, Turkey (in Europe), and Yugoslavia, being actually produced in Turkey or Yugoslavia. There is no exportation of crude opium from the United States to any other country.

The act of Dec 17, 1914, as amended, commonly known as the Harrison Narcotic Law, provides for a system of records designed to enable the Federal Government to keep a check on the channels of trade through which the drug, entering the country as crude opium, finally reaches the consumer in manufactured form, either as medicinal opium contained in tinctures, extracts, etc., or in the form of derivatives, such as morphine, codeine, etc. The consumption of individual drugs, as reflected in the sales of manufacturers and wholesale dealers, shows variation from year to year, due to seasonal influences and prevailing economic conditions.

[Reports published annually by the Government of the United States on the *Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs*.]

WILL S. WOOD

Orange, Fort. See Albany

Oratory. Though Indian orators⁷² like Pontiac and Red Jacket had stirred their people to defend their hunting grounds, the eloquence of the colonists was dormant until the Revolution aroused the talents of Samuel Adams, James Otis and the irresistible burning enthusiasm of Patrick Henry. In three great single speeches, on the "Parson's Cause" (1763), on the Stamp Act (1765), and in the "Liberty or Death" speech (1775)⁷³, Henry left his mark upon our history,

while his losing three-week fight against ratifying the Constitution (1788) triumphed by aiding the adoption of the first ten amendments (*see* Bill of Rights) John Randolph's perennial invective held sway until the period of controversy and compromise over the nature of the Union brought forth Clay, Calhoun and Webster. Clay was remarkable for frequency and fluency of persuasive utterance; Calhoun for subject mastery and logical presentation; Webster for magnificent voice, memory and presence. In his plea for Dartmouth College (1818), his commemorative address at Bunker Hill (1825) and his deliberative oration in "Reply to Hayne" (1830)^{qq}, Webster attained the summit of eloquence in three distinct types of speech. The roll of eminent speakers of the middle period would include J. Q. Adams, Thomas H. Benton, Thomas Corwin, S. S. Prentiss, Robert Toombs and William Yancey. The sonorous voice and superb confidence of Stephen A. Douglas were matched with the admirable directness of Lincoln in their debates^{qq} (1858), which marked the apogee of this style of political campaigning. Lincoln's inaugural addresses have been the best of their kind.

Except for Charles Sumner, Albert J. Beveridge and the elder LaFollette, our greatest orators since the Civil War have not been in Congress. A consummate speaker who achieved popular success in unpopular causes was Wendell Phillips. His Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard (1881) equaled those of Edward Everett (1824) and Ralph Waldo Emerson (1837). Civic reform enlisted the abilities of George W. Curtis; agnosticism, those of Robert G. Ingersoll, "The New South"^{qq} (1886), those of Henry W. Grady. The greatest pulpit orators have been Henry Ward Beecher, Phillips Brooks and Harry Emerson Fosdick. Foremost among legal advocates have been William Pinkney, Rufus Choate and Clarence Darrow, of whom Choate was noted for adaptability to any mood or subject. The Populist^{qq} orators were the precursors of William J. Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson as moulders of public opinion. Bryan was supreme in voice, Roosevelt in vigor, Wilson in earnest sincerity. All were effective phrase makers and had great skill in moral suasion—distinctions shared by Franklin D. Roosevelt, whose clarity of expression as a radio speaker has been unrivaled. Oratory has not declined in quality or importance but has only changed in mode. A definitive, critical history of American oratory is lacking.

[Edgar D. Jones, *Lords of Speech*; Henry Hardwicke, *History of Oratory and Orators*; James A. Woodburn and

Ordinances of 1784, 1785, 1787

Alexander Johnston, eds., *Representative American Orations*.]

HARVEY T. CARTER

Order of American Knights was a Civil War secret order of Northern Peace Democrats or "Copperheads,"^{qq} particularly strong in the Northwest, formed through reorganization of the Knights of the Golden Circle^{qq} in 1863. Again reorganized in 1864, when C. L. Vallandigham became supreme commander, the order took the name of Sons of Liberty^{qq}.

[E. C. Kirkland, *The Peacemakers of 1864*.]

CHARLES H. COLEMAN

Order of the Star-Spangled Banner. *See* American (or Know-Nothing) Party.

Orders in Council are executive edicts in Great Britain, issued in the name of the king, "by and with the advice of his privy council." They have the force of law until superseded by acts of Parliament. Among the many orders in council promulgated in British history, two are of primary interest for their influence upon the United States. They are the Orders in Council of Jan. 7 and Nov. 11, 1807, Britain's reply to the Berlin Decree^{qq} of Napoleon.

Aimed at neutral commerce in general, in an endeavor to overthrow the economic foundations of Napoleon's power, they affected principally the United States as the chief of neutral carriers. The Orders of Jan. 7 placed French commerce under a blockade^{qq} and forbade neutrals^{qq} to trade from one port to another under Napoleon's jurisdiction. Commercial strangulation advanced a further step when, by the Orders of Nov. 11, it was stipulated that neutral ships, meaning American, might not enter any ports "from which . . . the British flag is excluded, and all ports or places in the colonies belonging to his majesty's enemies, shall, from henceforth, be subject to the same restrictions . . . as if the same were actually blockaded by his majesty's naval forces, in the most strict and rigorous manner."

These Orders were superseded on April 26, 1809, by a blockade of the Netherlands, France and Italy; and in June, 1812, too late to avert the War of 1812^{qq}, the Orders were actually repealed, subject to certain modifications, in what constituted a major victory for American diplomacy.

[L. M. Sears, *A History of American Foreign Relations*; H. S. Commager, ed., *Documents of American History*.]

LOUIS MARTIN SEARS

Ordinances of 1784, 1785 and 1787, THE, were enacted in connection with the development of a policy for the settlement of the country north-

west of the Ohio River (*see* Northwest Territory) The establishment of the government of the Confederation⁷⁰ was delayed several years over the issue of the disposition of the western lands⁷¹. Seven states had western land claims, six had none, and the latter refused to join the Confederation until the former should cede their lands to the new government, to be utilized for the common benefit of all the states.

In 1780 New York led the way, whereupon Congress passed a resolution pledging that the lands the states might cede to the general government would be erected into new states which should be admitted to the Union on a basis of equality with the existing states. This vital decision made possible the future extension of the nation across the continent, for it is unthinkable that without it the people west of the Alleghenies would ever have submitted to a state of permanent dependence upon the original states.

Connecticut and Virginia followed New York, and the Confederation was established, March 1, 1781. With the close of the war the problems of reorganization which success entailed became more insistent, and among them the disposition of the western country loomed foremost. Among various projects propounded, one by Thomas Jefferson, which Congress enacted (April 23), became known as the Ordinance of 1784. It provided for an artificial division of the entire West into sixteen districts, eligible to statehood upon attaining a population of 20,000. Although subsequently repealed, the Ordinance of 1784 contributed to America's developing colonial policy its second basic idea—the establishment of temporary governments, under the fostering oversight of Congress, until a population sufficient for statehood should be attained (*see* Territorial Governments).

Next year (May 20, 1785) the Ordinance "for ascertaining the mode of disposing of lands in the Western territory" was enacted. Since the dawn of civilization individual landholdings had been bounded and identified by such marks as trees, stakes and stones, and in the absence of any scientific system of surveying and recording titles of ownership to them, intolerable confusion, with resultant disputes and individual hardships, existed. In its stead, the Ordinance of 1785 provided a scientific system of surveying and subdividing land with clear-cut establishment of both boundaries and titles (*see* Public Lands, Survey of). The unit of survey is the township, six miles square, with boundaries based on meridians of longitude and parallels of latitude. The townships are laid out both east and west and north and south of base lines cross-

ing at right angles; within, the township is subdivided into thirty-six square-mile sections, and these, in turn, into minor rectangles of any desired size.

In March, 1786, a group of New Englanders organized at Boston the Ohio Company of Associates⁷². The leaders were able men of affairs who had very definite ideas concerning the colony they proposed to found. They opened negotiations with Congress, which made the desired grant of land and on July 13, 1787, enacted the notable Ordinance (which the petitioners had drafted) for the government of the territory northwest of the Ohio. It provided for a temporary government by agents appointed by Congress, but when the colony numbered 5000 adult free males, a representative legislature was to be established, and upon the attainment of 60,000 population the territory would be admitted to statehood.

The Ordinance also provided for the future division of the territory into not less than three nor more than five states; and it contained a series of compacts forever unalterable save by common consent, safeguarding the rights of the future inhabitants of the territory. These established religious freedom, prohibited slavery, guaranteed the fundamental rights of English liberty and just treatment of the Indians, and a notable summary of the fundamental spirit of New England was supplied in the declaration that "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

The Ordinance of 1784 contributed a fundamental idea to America's colonial system. Those of 1785 and 1787 still remain as landmarks in the orderly development of the American scheme of life. Under the operation of the policies they first established, millions of Americans today enjoy a security of life and property and a degree of liberty to which most of the people of the earth are still strangers.

[B. A. Hinsdale, *The Old Northwest*; W. E. Peters, *Ohio Lands and Their Subdivisions*; M. M. Quaife, *Wisconsin, Its History and Its People*, Chap. XVIII.]

M. M. QUAIFFE

Ordinance. This term covers a large variety of military articles. In early years the term was reserved for combat equipment such as rifles, ammunition, cannon and explosives; but the mechanized character of modern war has expanded the ordinance list immensely. Over 100,000 separate items of ordinance equipment were manufactured in the United States during the World

War. Difficulties encountered in the procurement of weapons during the American Revolution led to the establishment of national arsenals at Springfield, Mass., and Harpers Ferry, Va. The Ordnance Department of the United States Army was formed in 1812, with Col. Decius Wadsworth as the first Chief of Ordnance.

The policy of the War Department⁹⁷ has been to manufacture ordnance matériel in national arsenals⁹⁸ in time of peace, and to rely on private contractors to expand the output in time of war. During the Civil War, which was primarily a struggle between infantry, over 4,000,000 muskets were issued to the Union armies as against 7892 cannon. The supply of small arms did not meet the demand until 1862. In spite of criticism leveled against the Ordnance Department during the Spanish-American and World wars, the quality of American ordnance matériel and the rate of manufacture compares favorably with the experience of foreign countries. It required from twelve to twenty-four months for the conversion of peace-time industries to large-scale war production in England, France and the United States during the World War. The delays incident to the production of weapons on an immense scale in 1917-18 have led to the establishment of plans for the mobilization⁹⁹ of industry in wartime in the United States.

[W. Crozier, *Ordnance and the World War; Reports of the Chief of Ordnance, 1849-1919.*]

H. A. DEWEERD

Oregon. Long before the name Oregon became restricted to the present state it designated the Pacific coast region west of the Rocky Mountains, north of California and south of Alaska. Three nations were chiefly responsible for the exploration of its coastline, Spain, England and the United States. The first European known to have sighted the Oregon coast was Sir Francis Drake¹⁰⁰ (who, escaping from the Spaniards after one of his raids in 1577, sailed along a portion of the southern Oregon coast). Aroused by this incident, the Spanish sought to secure the control of the coast by exploration. Juan Perez in 1774 reached the southern part of Alaska, and one of Bruno Heceta's ships reached the latitude of 58° in 1775. The English government sent one exploring expedition to the Northwest coast under Capt. Cook (1776), and one under Capt. George Vancouver (1792)¹⁰¹. Early American exploration was of a private character and incidental to the coastal fur trade; but one of the most important discoveries, that of the Columbia River¹⁰², was made in this trade by Robert Gray (1792).

The first governmental exploring expedition

to reach Oregon overland was sent by President Jefferson under the leadership of Meriwether Lewis¹⁰³ and William Clark (1804-6).

American fur traders entered the region with the Pacific Fur Company's¹⁰⁴ establishment of their post at the mouth of the Columbia River (1811). During the War of 1812 British fur interests supplanted the American interests. Before 1830 British fur-trading posts were scattered from the upper waters of the Columbia to California. The British retained the dominant place in the trade until after the boundary settlement (1846), successfully excluding American interests such as those of Jedediah Smith¹⁰⁵ and Nathaniel Wyeth.

Missions for the Indians opened in 1834 when Jason Lee established the Oregon Mission¹⁰⁶ of the Methodist Church in the Willamette Valley¹⁰⁷. The American Board Mission under Marcus Whitman¹⁰⁸ and Henry Spalding was established in the interior in 1836. The missions became a major factor in arousing the interest in the Oregon Country, which resulted in the coming of the independent settler.

Each year after 1842 saw large numbers of settlers coming over the Oregon Trail¹⁰⁹ to make their homes in Oregon, most of the first settlers taking up land claims in the Willamette Valley. No legal title to land was possible for the country was held jointly by Great Britain and the United States under the Convention of 1818¹¹⁰ and no provision had been made for such title (*see* Joint Occupation). Essentially, all land was held by "Squatters' rights." The settlers established a government by compact (Provisional Government-1843) which met the civil and military needs of the community until the territorial government was established (1849).

Oregon was the subject of frequent negotiations between the United States and Great Britain for almost thirty years before they adjusted their rival claims by the Oregon Treaty of 1846¹¹¹. This treaty extended the boundary along the 49th parallel from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, deflecting southward around the end of Vancouver Island to leave the island a unit under the British control (*see* Haro Channel Dispute).

The territory of Oregon as first established included not only the present State of Oregon but also Washington, Idaho and a portion of Montana. Washington was first separated from the parent territory (1853); Idaho was next carved out (1863); and Montana was the last to become a separate territory (1864).

The original movement of settlers to Oregon had been to the Willamette Valley, hence south of the Columbia River (*see* Walla Walla Settle-

ments). This center of settlement determined that Oregon should first receive the full status of statehood. In 1857 the people voted to seek statehood and elected delegates for a constitutional convention. On Feb. 12, 1859, Congress passed a law admitting Oregon as a state.

[Charles H. Carey, *A General History of Oregon prior to 1861*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Oregon, THE, was built in San Francisco, 1891-96. Under Capt. Charles E. Clark, it made a famous run, March 19 to May 26, 1898, from the Golden Gate through the Straits of Magellan to Key West. Joining Sampson's blockading squadron off Santiago^o, the *Oregon*, because she was almost opposite the harbor entrance, was able to engage effectively all the Spanish cruisers on July 3. The *Oregon's* trip gave dramatic evidence of the need for quicker communication by water between the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, and it was thus an important factor leading to the construction of the Panama Canal^o.

[F. S. Hill, *Twenty Six Historic Ships*.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Oregon Caravans. From 1842 until the era of transcontinental railways each year saw emigrants following the Oregon Trail^o to the Pacific coast. Travel was by covered wagons^o, usually drawn by oxen, although mules and horses were widely used. Because of the danger from Indian attack, and the keenly felt need of mutual assistance, caravans were commonly organized at the Missouri frontier. Often notices that indicated a time and place of assembling for organization were sent out by men interested in securing the protection of a group. Officers were elected, rules of conduct adopted, and a guide agreed upon. If forceful leaders were found a considerable degree of discipline and effective order was maintained. The parties which made the toilsome and dangerous trek with greatest safety were those who created and maintained the most effective organization.

[Charles H. Carey, *A General History of Oregon prior to 1861*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Oregon Land Frauds, THE, were brought to light during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt. They were effected under the Homestead Act (1862), under the Timber and Stone Act (1878) and under exchange of state school lands for government timber lands. The device of securing state school lands of little or no value at a cost of \$1.25 an acre and exchanging them for valuable timber lands was in operation as early as 1890. The system of dum-

my entries on homestead and timber lands under which large lumber companies, often controlled by capitalists from Wisconsin, Michigan or Minnesota, acquired immense tracts of valuable timber land was extensively used in the period 1890 to 1904. The great increase in entries in Oregon under the Timber and Stone Act (from 646 in 1901 to 4209 in 1903, and 3260 in 1904) seems to indicate the height of the period of fraud.

These frauds were made possible by the connivance and assistance of state and Federal government officials. They were exposed through the investigations of Francis J. Heney and William J. Burns. Heney secured thirty-three convictions out of thirty-four prosecutions. One of those convicted was a United States senator.

[Stephen Arnold Douglas Puter, *Looters of the Public Domain*.]

R. C. CLARK

Oregon Memorial of 1838. During the period of "joint occupation"^o of Oregon there was great uncertainty among the settlers concerning land titles. When Jason Lee, the head of the Methodist Mission established in Oregon in 1834 (see Oregon Missions), went East in 1838 he carried a petition addressed to Congress. It was dated March 16, 1838, and signed by thirty-six residents of Oregon, including a few French Canadian settlers. This number included a large percentage of all the settlers in the Willamette Valley^o. The petition asked that the United States take possession of Oregon which they believed to be "the germ of a great state." The memorial was presented to the Senate by Sen. Linn, chairman of the committee on territories, on Jan. 28, 1839. Lee also had correspondence with Rep. Caleb Cushing of Massachusetts, and both Linn and Cushing were stimulated by the memorial and by Lee's correspondence to interest Congress in extending control over Oregon. This congressional agitation over Oregon in turn greatly stimulated the popular interest in and ultimate settling of Oregon. In connection with the memorial, Lee urged that protection be extended to the infant colony and that the pioneers be protected in the title to their lands (see Oregon Treaty of 1846).

[Charles H. Carey, *A General History of Oregon prior to 1861*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Oregon Missions. Attention was called to the need for Christian work among the Indians of the Pacific Northwest by an appeal made to Gen. William Clark of St. Louis in 1831 by four Flat-head Indians^o who had journeyed from the Oregon Country asking that they be given religious instructors. A description of this visit was first

published in the *Christian Advocate and Journal* of New York in 1833, and was widely copied in other religious journals. The Methodists⁷⁰ immediately recommended the establishment of an Oregon mission, and Jason Lee, a young New Englander, was appointed to head it. By September, 1834, he and his party had reached Vancouver. A mission among the Flatheads being found to be impracticable, Lee established a mission in the Willamette Valley⁷¹. A year later (1835) the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions resolved to found a mission in the Pacific Northwest and commissioned Marcus Whitman and Henry H. Spalding to carry out the enterprise. Work was begun near what is now Walla Walla⁷² and soon a prosperous mission was in operation. Both Lee and Whitman became interested in bringing colonists to Oregon, a policy which their mission boards did not approve. Largely because of this fact Lee was removed. Whitman⁷³ and his wife with twelve others were brutally murdered by the Indians in 1847.

The Catholics⁷⁴ were also active in the same region, where their work was favored by the Hudson's Bay Company⁷⁵ as being less likely to interfere with the fur trade. Under the intrepid Jesuit, Father P. J. DeSmet (1840-50), Catholic missions were established in the region and within a few years 6000 converts were claimed.

[C. J. Brosnan, *Jason Lee, Prophet of the New Oregon*; Clifford M. Drury, *Marcus Whitman, Pioneer and Martyr*; E. Lavelle, *The Life of Father DeSmet, S. J., 1801-1873*; George W. Hinman, *The American Indian and Christian Missions*; Clifford M. Drury, *Henry Harmon Spalding*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Oregon Parochial School Case. In 1925 the Supreme Court by unanimous opinion (*Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary*, 268 U. S. 510) invalidated an Oregon statute adopted in 1922 by initiative and referendum (*see Oregon System*), under which all children would have been required to attend the public schools. Ostensibly an education law and as such within the reserved powers⁷⁶ of the state, it was well known from discussion in the course of the referendum that it was aimed at the parochial schools. It was not a compulsory education law or a reasonable regulation of school standards. The Supreme Court ruled, in effect, that children are not public wards, that parents have a right to control the selection of schools for their children, and that the owners and teachers of those private schools have a right to conduct their activities. The statute was an obvious abridgment of liberty under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment⁷⁷.

This decision, generally regarded as a wise and wholesome exposition of American ideals, is frequently cited in refutation of the common misconception that the Fourteenth Amendment is useful only as a protection of "property rights."

W. A. ROBINSON

Oregon Question, THE, was the question of national ownership of the Pacific Northwest. By successive treaties the territory was defined until it meant the territory west of the Rocky Mountains, north of 42° and south of 54° 40'. All or major portions of this vast territory were the subject of the conflicting claims of ownership of Spain, Great Britain, the United States and Russia.

Spain's exclusive claims, based upon discoveries of her seamen along the coast and her special claims of dominance in the Pacific, were successfully challenged by Great Britain in the Nootka Convention⁷⁸ (1790); and in the Adams-Onís Treaty⁷⁹ (1819) Spain surrendered to the United States all claims north of 42°. Russia, whose claims were the weakest of any of the four powers, withdrew all claims south of 54° 40' by separate treaties with the United States (1824) and Great Britain (1825). With the boundary between the United States and British America having been drawn as far West as the Rockies by the Convention of 1818⁸⁰, the boundaries of Oregon were determined, and the territory was left by the same treaty in joint occupation⁸¹ of the two claimants, the United States and Great Britain.

Until the final division of the territory between the two powers in June, 1846, by the extension of the 49th parallel to the sea, deflecting southward to leave Vancouver Island (*see Haro Channel Dispute*) to the British, the Oregon question was the subject of intermittent correspondence between the two governments. British claims were repeatedly summarized as depending upon the discoveries of Sir Francis Drake, Capt. James Cook and Capt. George Vancouver, the Nootka Convention with Spain⁸², the exploration and occupation of the British fur companies (*see Hudson's Bay Company*; *North West Company*). The American claims were based upon the discovery of the Columbia River by Capt. Robert Gray (1792), explorations of the Lewis and Clark expedition (1802-6), the establishment of Astoria (1811) by the Pacific Fur Company and its restoration under the Convention of 1818, the Spanish claims, and American settlements which started with the Oregon missions⁸³ (1834) and had constantly increased after 1842.

American public interest became centered

upon Oregon by successive unsuccessful efforts to make land claims available for American settlers. Under the leadership of John Floyd of Virginia such an effort was first made in 1821. Later congressional leadership concerning Oregon passed to Sen. Lewis F. Linn of Missouri. The first missionary settlements aroused widespread interest, and each successive group of settlers which poured into Oregon after 1842 built up the interest. By 1844 the popular feeling over Oregon found expression in the political slogan of "Fifty-four Forty or Fight,"⁷⁹ which was widely used in the campaign in which James K. Polk was elected President. Action followed quickly upon Polk's taking office. On April 27, 1846, Congress authorized the President to give Great Britain notice of the termination of the Joint Occupation Treaty. The British government was distinctly a peace government, and the American Government clearly overstated its claims, so by June 18, 1846, a compromise treaty settled the Oregon question by continuing the boundary east of the Rockies (49°) to the sea (see Oregon Treaty).

[Charles H. Carey, *A General History of Oregon prior to 1861.*]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Oregon Short Line Railway, THE, was a subsidiary corporation of the Union Pacific Railway⁸⁰ incorporated by Congress in 1881 and completed early in 1882 to run 550 miles from Granger, Wyo., on the main line of the Union Pacific to Huntington, Oreg., where it connected with the line of the Oregon Railroad and Navigation Company built to Portland, Oreg., in 1884. It was built to develop the Pacific Northwest and to secure its traffic for the Union Pacific. In 1897 this road was sold under foreclosure and organized independently but was reacquired by the Union Pacific in 1899, with which it is now completely merged.

[Nelson Trotman, *History of the Union Pacific.*]

R. C. CLARK

"Oregon System," THE. In 1902 Oregon adopted a constitutional amendment establishing a system of direct voter participation in law-making. The Initiative⁸¹ permits a specified percentage of voters to place a law, or constitutional amendment, before the voters for their final action without reference to the legislature. By the Referendum⁸² a law, passed by the legislature, can be referred to the people for final acceptance or rejection. Closely associated with these two features were other features commonly known as parts of the "Oregon system," including the Recall, Direct Primary⁸³, Presidential Preference

Primary, and state printed campaign textbooks.

[James D. Barnett, *The Operation of the Initiative, Referendum, and Recall in Oregon.*]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Oregon Trail, THE, was first dimly traced across the country from the Missouri River to the Columbia River by explorers and fur traders. After 1842 it was worn into a deeply rutted highway by the pioneers in their covered wagons. In 1805 the course of Lewis and Clark⁸⁴ in the Snake and Columbia rivers region covered a portion of what was later to be the famous pioneer highway. A few years later (1810) a party of the Missouri Fur Company⁸⁵ traveled through the South Pass⁸⁶ and thus discovered an important part of the Trail. A party of Astorians⁸⁷, under Robert Stuart, returning to the East in 1812 largely followed the route which later became the Oregon Trail. Two independent American fur traders, Capt. Benjamin Bonneville⁸⁸ and Capt. Nathaniel J. Wyeth, between the years 1832 and 1836, led their companies over this route. Knowledge of the Trail as a passable route was current among the traders on the frontier and became common property. This knowledge became available for the use of companies of settlers in two forms: traders who had been over the route and were willing to hire out as guides; and in the form of printed guide books compiled by enterprising travelers. These guide books appeared surprisingly early and the copies which reached the end of the Trail were thumbed and worn.

The distances on the Trail were calculated with a high degree of accuracy. One of the old guide books gives a tabulation of the distances which shows the established Trail. The points used to mark the way were selected for a variety of reasons, such as conspicuous landmarks, difficult streams to ford, the infrequent posts at which a few supplies might be obtained. This old guide book (J. M. Shively, *Route and Distances to Oregon and California*, 1846) marks the way from Missouri River to the mouth of the Columbia River as follows:

	MILES
From Independence to the Crossings of Kansas	102
Crossings of Blue	83
Platte River	119
Crossings of South Platte	163
To North Fork	20
To Fort Larima [Laramie]	153
From Larima to Crossing of North Fork of the Platte	140

	MILES
To Independence Rock on Sweet Water	50
Fort Bridger	229
Bear River	68
Soda Springs	94
To Fort Hall	57
Salmon Falls	160
Crossings of Snake River	22
To Crossings of Boise River	69
Fort Boise	45
Dr. Whitman's Mission	190
Fort Walawala [Walla Walla]	25
Dallis Mission [The Dalles]	120
Cascade Falls, on the Columbia	50
Fort Vancouver	41
Astoria	90

The author could well have left off the last ninety miles and given the distance into the Willamette Valley⁷⁰, which was the destination of most of the travelers.

The interest in Oregon became so widespread along the frontier about 1842 that emigrating societies were formed to encourage people to move to Oregon. By lectures, letters and personal visits, members of these societies secured recruits for the long journey. Independence⁷¹, Mo., was the most frequent place of departure, and shortly after leaving there the companies commonly organized a government by electing officers and adopting rules of conduct (*see Oregon Caravans*). The emigrants gathered in time to leave in the early spring to take advantage of the fresh pasturage for their animals and to allow all possible time for the long journey.

From Independence the companies followed the old Santa Fé Trail⁷² a two days' journey of some forty miles to where a crude signpost pointed to the "Road to Oregon." At Fort Laramie⁷³, where the Trail left the rolling plains for the mountainous country, there was an opportunity to overhaul and repair wagons. The next point where repairs could be made with outside help was Fort Bridger⁷⁴, some 394 miles beyond Laramie and about 1070 miles from Independence. The Trail used South Pass⁷⁵ through the Rockies. It is a low pass less than 7500 feet above sea level and was easily passable for the heavy covered wagons⁷⁶. The difficulties of travel greatly increased on the Pacific side. Much barren country had to be crossed under conditions which wore out and killed the already exhausted horses and oxen. At Fort Hall⁷⁷, in the Snake River country, the first immigrants gave up their wagons and repacked on horses; but shortly, determined individuals refused to do so and worked a way through for their wagons. The Grande

Ronde Valley offered grass to recruit the worn beasts of burden before the immigrant attempted the almost impassable way through the Blue Mountains. Emerging from these mountains the immigrant followed the Umatilla River to the Columbia, which he followed to Fort Vancouver⁷⁸, the last portion often being made on rafts. The journey of some 2000 miles over the Oregon Trail was the greatest trek of recorded history.

The wagon travel during the 1840's and 1850's became so heavy that the road was a clearly defined and deeply rutted way across the country. When the ruts became too deep for travel, parallel roads were broken. So deeply was the Oregon Trail worn that generations after the last covered wagon had passed over it hundreds of miles of it could still be traced. To the awed Indians it seemed the symbol of a nation of countless numbers.

The over 2000 miles of the Oregon Trail tested human strength and endurance as it has rarely been tested. The Trail was littered with castoff possessions, often of considerable monetary as well as great sentimental value. Worn draft animals could no longer drag the heavy wagons and even the most prized possessions had to be left standing beside the Trail. The carcasses of the innumerable dead cattle and horses were left along the Trail while the bodies of the human dead were buried in shallow graves. The diaries of the overland journey note with fearful monotony the number of new graves passed each day on the Trail. Cholera⁷⁹ was the terrible scourge which struck the bravest heart with terror.

From 1842 through the 1850's the companies came over the Trail in large numbers, to dwindle away in the 1860's. The bitter experiences of the first companies, who knew so little about equipment, were passed on to the later companies, and as the years went by better adapted equipment was used. Especially constructed wagons were used, oxen largely replaced horses, and supplies were selected more wisely. The way became better established, even including crude ferries at some of the most difficult river crossings; but to the day that the last covered wagon was dragged over the rutted Oregon Trail it was the way of hardship and danger which tested the pioneer stock of the West.

[James C. Bell, Jr., *Opening a Highway to the Pacific, 1838-1846.*]
ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Oregon Treaty of 1846, THE, fixed the boundary between the United States and British America at the 49th parallel west of the Rocky Mountains except at the western terminus of that line

where it was to swerve southward around Vancouver Island and out through the Strait of Juan deFuca. By the Convention of 1818⁷, renewed in 1827, the United States and Great Britain had agreed that the country claimed by either west of the Rockies be free and open to the citizens of the two powers (*see* Joint Occupation). Acting under a joint resolution of Congress (April 26, 1846), the President transmitted the year's notice for the termination of that treaty, expressing the hope that this would hasten a friendly settlement (*see* Oregon Question). Lord Aberdeen, the British Foreign Minister, then drafted a treaty (May 18, 1846) which was accepted by President Polk and the Senate (June 15, 1846). The election of Polk as President in 1844 on a platform that demanded the whole Oregon Country, its rapid settlement by Americans, the purpose of the Hudson's Bay Company⁷ to move its main establishment from Vancouver⁷ on the Columbia to Victoria on Vancouver Island, and the adoption by Great Britain and the United States of mutual beneficial tariff policies in 1846—corn-law repeal and Walker tariff—were factors in influencing a settlement of this boundary dispute at this time.

[S. F. Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*; R. C. Clark, *A History of the Willamette Valley, Oregon*.]

R. C. CLARK

Organic Law, as used in the United States, has two meanings. In one sense, it refers to any fundamental set of rules and principles establishing the organs of government, distributing the powers of government among them, and defining the reciprocal rights and duties of the government and the people. In other words it is synonymous with the term "constitution" in its broadest significance. A second and more restricted use of the term is in its application to the acts of Congress providing a form of government for the territories⁷. These organic acts serve as a fundamental law for the territory until its government as a state is provided for, in a constitution framed for that purpose and adopted by the people of the territory, pursuant to an enabling act passed by Congress.

[C. Kettleborough, ed., *The State Constitutions*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Organized Labor. *See* Labor Unions.

Oriental Religions and Cults in the United States are comparatively recent importations, largely subsequent to the Civil War. The most prominent religion is Buddhism, its adherents being mainly Japanese who have entered the

country since 1870. There are seventy-three Buddhist temples in Pacific coast states, especially in the cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland, Portland and Seattle. There are several in New York. They represent, chiefly, the Buddhism of Mahayana, or the theistic "Great Vehicle," whatever the sect. The Chinese worship (or propitiate and exorcise) spirits of many sorts, and a few worship at the higher levels of ancestor-commemoration and "Confucian" wisdom. There are "joss-houses" in San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and Boston. The Sikhs of the Imperial Valley, Calif., worship in their several *gurdwaras*, following the monotheistic teachings of Nanak and Gobind Singh. Then, there is the Christian Church of Armenia in America, with 30,000 members, organized in 1889-1902 among Armenian immigrants in Massachusetts. There are now Armenian churches in Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and California.

Cults are more numerous, including Near Eastern Baha'ism, which claims about fifty assemblies; and many from India, such as Theosophy⁷, which was established in New York in 1875 by the Russian, Madame Blavatsky. There are now (1939) over 200 lodges where the 10,000 Theosophists of California, Washington, Minnesota, Ohio and New York meet. Other Hindu cults are the Vedanta Society, with a small membership, organized in 1898 following the visit of Swami Vivekananda; Krishna (New York, 1904); Yogoda Sat-sanga (Boston, 1920); Sri Mariya Ashrama (Philadelphia, 1923); and Dharma Mandal (New York, 1928).

[*Religious Bodies*, U. S. Bureau of the Census; A. W. Palmer, *Orientalism in American Life*; W. Thomas, *Hinduism Invades America*; E. G. Browne, *The Babi Religion*.]

JOHN CLARK ARCHER

Original Package. The original-package doctrine for determining the point at which goods pass from Federal control over interstate commerce⁷ to state control over local or intrastate commerce has been used for a century. It was first enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Brown v. Maryland*⁷, a tax case under a Maryland act of 1821 requiring importers and dealers in foreign goods within the state to take out a fifty-dollar license. The state's power to impose such a fee was questioned, and the Court held, in respect to such goods, that "while remaining the property of the importer, in his warehouse, in the original form or package in which it was imported, a tax upon it is too plainly a duty on imports to escape the prohibition of the Constitution."

The later and better-known case of *Leisy v.*

Hardin (135 U. S. 100, 1890), in which the Supreme Court ruled that Iowa state laws could not be applied to interstate freight shipments as long as they remained in the original package, unsold, resulted in the immediate passage by Congress of the Wilson Act, to protect the internal police powers of the states. Such shipments were still in interstate commerce and were, therefore, under Federal—not state—jurisdiction. Thus goods in interstate shipment have not “arrived” for purposes of regulation by the state, until they have been delivered into the hands of the consignee, and the original package has been broken; for purposes of taxation by the state, until they have come permanently at rest within the borders of the state, until they have become mingled with the wealth of the state, whether or not the original package has been broken. In most cases, the change for both purposes occurs simultaneously.

[Charles K. Burdick, *The Law of the American Constitution*; W. W. Willoughby, *Constitutional Law of the United States*; James T. Young, *The New American Government and Its Work*.]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Oriskany, Battle of (Aug. 6, 1777). The British threefold plan of campaign for 1777 included in its strategy the advance of Lt. Col. Barry St. Leger across New York from Oswego^o to meet Burgoyne and Howe in Albany. On Aug. 3, St. Leger with an army of approximately 1200, mostly Tories^o under Col. John Butler and Sir John Johnson and Indians led by Joseph Brant, appeared before Fort Stanwix and demanded its surrender. In the meantime Gen. Nicholas Herkimer had called out the Tryon County militia, and on Aug. 4 with an army of about 800 men he left Fort Dayton. The following evening he sent three messengers to advise Col. Peter Gansevoort, the commanding officer at Fort Stanwix, that he planned to fall upon St. Leger's rear when Gansevoort attacked in front. Three guns were to be fired as a signal. The next morning the Americans advanced to a point about eight miles from the fort. Here, Herkimer wished to stop until he received the signal. His caution seemed excessive to his officers. A violent quarrel followed, and against his better judgment Herkimer gave the order to advance.

Brant's Indians had reported Herkimer's approach to St. Leger and a detachment of Tories and Indians under Sir John Johnson had been sent to ambush the advancing Americans. About two miles west of Oriskany Creek the main body of the Americans entered a ravine, followed by the heavy baggage wagons. A deadly volley from both sides met them. The rearguard, still

on the hill above, retreated. The main body was thrown into confusion, but rallied and one of the bloodiest battles of the Revolution took place. A sudden thunder shower added to the tumult. Early in the conflict a ball killed Herkimer's horse and shattered his own leg. He had his saddle placed at the foot of a beech tree and lighting his pipe calmly continued to give orders. Suddenly the signal guns were heard. The expected sortie was taking place. The Indians fled and the Tories retreated from the Oriskany battlefield, but the weakened American forces were unable to proceed to the relief of the fort. Much-needed supplies and ammunition were, however, captured during the sortie from Fort Stanwix, and St. Leger, unable to force the surrender of the fort, on Aug. 22 retreated to Oswego (see British Campaign of 1777).

[J. A. Scott, *Fort Stanwix and Oriskany*.]

A. C. FLICK

Orleans, Fort, was built, in 1722, on an island in the Missouri at the mouth of Grand River by deBourgmont^o under instructions from the Company of the Indies^o, to hold the line of the river against Spanish incursions from the southwest. It was also the French intention, by constructing another fort on the Kansas River and placating the Indians, to open a trade route to Santa Fé^o. Orleans was the first fort built on the Missouri.

[J. Winsor, *The Mississippi Basin*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Orleans, Territory of, now the State of Louisiana^o, was so called only during the period of American territorial government. The region it included was probably first visited by the survivors of DeSoto's^o expedition in 1543, and as part of Louisiana was claimed by LaSalle^o for France in 1682. Under the French the province was successively governed under charter to Crozat (1712-17), by Law's Western Company and the India Company (1717-31)^o, and finally as a crown colony. Gov. Bienville founded New Orleans^o in 1718, and made it the capital in 1722. Louisiana was ceded to Spain in 1762 (see Fontainebleau, Treaty of), returned to France in 1800 (see San Ildefonso, Treaty of), and sold to the United States in 1803 (see Louisiana Purchase). The actual transfer occurred Dec. 20, 1803. The Territory of Orleans, as organized by the act approved March 26, 1804, included the present State of Louisiana except the part east of the Mississippi and north of Lake Pontchartrain^o. A governor, secretary, three judges and a council of thirteen members, all appointed by

the President, constituted the government as first organized, but a popularly elected legislature was provided by the act approved March 2, 1805. William C. C. Claiborne was governor throughout the territorial period. Orleans, under the present name of Louisiana, was admitted as a state April 30, 1812.

[Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*; Dunbar Rowland, ed., *Claiborne Letter Books*.] EDGAR B. NIXON

Osage, Fort, was established under direction of Gen. William Clark in September, 1808, on the south bank of the Missouri River, nineteen miles east of present-day Kansas City, and manned by a company of infantry for protection of a government post for trade with the Osage^w tribes. To shorten lines of Missouri defence in the War of 1812, it was evacuated in June, 1813, but reoccupied in 1816. It maintained its importance as the most western outpost of American Government until the abandonment of government trade with the Indians in 1822, and the establishment of Fort Leavenworth^w in 1827.

[Kate L. Gregg, *Westward with Dragoons*.]

KATE L. GREGG

Osage Hedge, or *Maclura*, universally used on the prairies for fences, is a thorn-bearing plant producing a pale-green fruit larger than an orange from which the plant gets its name—Osage orange. The French discovered the Osage Indians^w using the tough, springy yellow wood for bows, and named the plant *bois d'arc* or bow wood. The first nurseries on the treeless prairies raised millions of these Osage orange, or, as they were commonly called, "hedge" plants, and sold them to the settlers for fences. The wood, although knotty and crooked, was used for tool handles, tongues for implements, and for fence posts which lasted for years. When allowed to grow, hedge furnished excellent wood for fuel. The thorn on the Osage orange gave an inventor the idea for perfecting barbed wire^w, which largely replaced hedge as a fencing agent. In the 20th century hedge has fallen into disfavor because it saps crops and obscures the roadway. Miles of this once-prized fence have been grubbed out at great expense.

[Walter P. Webb, *The Great Plains*; Everett Dick, *The Sod House Frontier*.]

EVERETT DICK

Osage Indians, THE, most important southern Siouan tribe of the western division, were found in historical times in Missouri in two principal bands, the Great Osage and the Little Osage. In 1802 nearly half of the Great Osage under a chief named Big Track migrated to the Arkan-

sas River, leaving the remainder of the tribe on the Osage River in Missouri.

By a treaty negotiated in 1808 the Osage ceded to the United States all their lands in Missouri and Arkansas, and subsequently they were found in the present Oklahoma. Entering into later treaties, they gave up more land and agreed to remove to what is now Kansas. By an act of Congress of 1870 their reservation was established comprising the present Osage County, Okla., where they now hold the lands on which they live. Their population was estimated at more than 5000 in 1845; but by 1855, after hundreds died from smallpox, they were reduced to 3500. They now number about 2000. In recent years they have enjoyed large incomes from the production of oil from their tribal holdings (see Indian Oil Lands).

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*; Grant Foreman, *Indians and Pioneers*, and *Advancing the Frontier*.]

GRANT FOREMAN

Osawatimie, The Battle of (Aug. 30, 1856). The town was attacked by about 250 proslavery men (supposedly Missourians) and was defended by John Brown with 40 men. The Free State^w men were soon dislodged from their position along the creek bank and fled, after which the village was sacked. Each side lost about six killed and several wounded.

[L. W. Spring, *Kansas, the Prelude to the War for the Union*.]

SAMUEL A. JOHNSON

Osborn v. U. S. Bank (9 Wheaton, 738, 1824). The jealousies of local banks and the restrictions on credits by the Bank of the United States^w in the crisis of 1818 led to the enactment by the Ohio legislature, February, 1819, of a tax of \$50,000 on each branch of the Bank in the state. The auditor was given unlimited right of search, even to entering the vaults of the Bank to collect the tax. Ralph Osborn, state auditor, sent an agent, John L. Harper, to the Chillicothe branch, and on Sept. 17, 1819, he took \$100,000 from its vaults, the taxes due from the two branches. After considerable delay the United States circuit court ruled against Osborn, who appealed to the Supreme Court. John Marshall's opinion, following the precedent of *McCulloch v. Maryland*^w, sustained the circuit court and held the Ohio law unconstitutional. The legislature had in 1820 passed a set of pronounced states' rights resolutions and had followed them with a law withdrawing the protection of state laws from the Bank. However, no attempt was made to nullify the decision.

[E. H. Roseboom and F. P. Weisenburger, *A History of Ohio*.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Osgoodites, THE, were a New Hampshire religious sect, followers of Jacob Osgood (1777-1844), who left the Free Will Baptists to form a new church in 1812, claiming special powers from God of prophecy and healing. The sect's religious services were noted for singing, exhortations and very frank comments on whatever or whomever displeased them. They were otherwise good neighbors, honest, abstemious and law-abiding, although they would not vote, hold office, or serve in the militia, then compulsory. After Osgood's death their number declined, and all were gone by 1890.

[J. O. Lyford, *History of the Town of Canterbury*; Jacob Osgood, in *Dictionary of American Biography*.]

HERBERT W. HILL

Ostend Manifesto. Expansionist ardor, unsatisfied even by the Mexican cession^o, was largely responsible for this blunder in our Cuban diplomacy. American slaveholders had dreaded the possibility of emancipation or revolution and the creation of a new Santo Domingo almost within sight of our shores. Cuba^o, furthermore, offered tempting possibilities for annexation and the establishment of another slave state. On April 7, 1853, President Pierce appointed Pierre Soulé minister to Spain with instructions to negotiate for the purchase of Cuba. Soulé failed completely; but in 1854 Spain was embarrassed by revolutionary outbreaks, and it was hoped that holders of Spanish bonds, tempted by the prospect of American cash reinforcing a dubious security, might exert pressure on the Madrid government. Soulé, James Buchanan, minister to Great Britain, and John Y. Mason, minister to France, were instructed by Secretary of State Marcy to confer on the Cuban situation. They met at Ostend in October, 1854, signing the notorious "manifesto" on the 15th. In effect, the conferees declared that should Spain refuse to sell, and should the United States consider Spain's further possession of Cuba inimical to our domestic interests, forcible seizure would be fully justified. The document caused a profound sensation, and amid a storm of denunciation, foreign and domestic, Secretary Marcy disavowed the declaration.

[A. A. Ettinger, *The Mission of Pierre Soulé, 1853-1855*; F. E. Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Osteopathy. The general application of manipulative methods, based upon recognition of the importance of structural integrity of the body, and linked with general application of the science of natural immunity, was developed by A. T. Still (1828-1917). It came as a revolt against

drugging and surgery. Though majoring in manipulative methods, osteopathy is a complete therapeutic system, including surgery, obstetrics and the other specialties. Dr. Still promulgated osteopathy at Baldwin, Kans., 1874, removed to Kirksville, Mo., 1875, practised osteopathy with the help of his sons, whom he had trained, and established the American School of Osteopathy in 1892, with seventeen students. By 1916 a full four-year course had been established and by 1924 there were six colleges. The number practising grew to 3000 in 1904, and to 9636 in 1939. Vermont, the first state to legalize the practice (1896), has been followed by all the other states, the District of Columbia, Hawaii and most Canadian provinces. The American Osteopathic Association was organized in 1897, followed by component societies in practically every state, as well as affiliated societies of specialists, educators, hospitals, etc.

[*Autobiography of Dr. A. T. Still*; E. R. Booth, *Booth's History of Osteopathy*; *Journal of the American Osteopathic Association*; Ray G. Hulburt, A. T. Still, Founder of Osteopathy, in *Missouri Historical Review*, 1924.]

RAY G. HULBURT

Oswegatchie, Fort. See Ogdensburg.

Oswego. In 1722, in spite of French claims to the region, English and Dutch traders began to assemble at Choueguen (Oswego) where they carried on a thriving trade with the Indians. In 1726-27 Gov. Burnet dispatched a number of soldiers and workmen to construct a fort on the west bank of the Oswego River near its mouth. Intruding into the line of French fortifications which controlled the Great Lakes^o and the waterways to the south, this post was the most important English fortification west of the Hudson, for it created a barrier to further French encroachments into northern New York.

From this point, on June 28, 1755, was launched the first English vessel to sail on the Great Lakes, and on Aug. 18, Gen. William Shirley arrived with an expedition destined for an attack on Fort Niagara^o. This move was deferred, but on the east side of the Oswego River, a quarter of a mile from Fort Oswego, the British erected a post which they named Fort Ontario. In 1756 these establishments were under attack by the French under DeVilliers, and on Aug. 13-14 they were captured and destroyed by the Marquis deMontcalm. Abandoned by the French, the ruins were later converted into a fortified camp for the British troops under Prideaux.

In 1759-60 the British rebuilt Fort Ontario, and it again became a base for military opera-

tions. In July and August, 1760, it was the rendezvous of Amherst's army, augmented by 1300 French Iroquois who came to make peace with the British (*see* French and Indian War). It was there, in July, 1766, that Sir William Johnson met in council the great Ottawa chieftain, Pontiac^o, who signed a treaty of everlasting peace with Great Britain. (*See also* Niagara, Great Indian Council at, 1764.)

Fort Ontario continued as a peaceful trading post, and in 1774 was dismantled, with only a few men left to keep it from falling into decay. In 1777, however, it was St. Leger's base in his operations in the Mohawk Valley in connection with Burgoyne's invasion^o.

In the War of 1812, Oswego was a naval base, and the headquarters of Commodore Chauncey (*see* Montreal, The Wilkinson Expedition against). On May 6, 1814, it was attacked and captured by the British. The settlement was incorporated as a village in 1828 and chartered as a city in 1848.

[Frank H. Severance, *An Old Frontier of France.*]

ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Otsego Lands, THE, consisting of a tract of 100,000 acres on the west side of the Susquehanna River and Otsego Lake, embracing the present town of Cooperstown, N. Y., and extending north and south of it, was purchased from the Indians by George Croghan and patented to him and associates in 1769. With future financial profits in mind, Croghan began a series of improvements including the clearing of land, the construction of two houses and a bridge near Oak Creek. He became, however, involved in financial difficulties, mortgaged his holdings (*see* Burlington Company), and, being unable to sell land to actual settlers, the greater part of the tract passed to William Cooper and Andrew Craig of Burlington, N. J. Both Cooper and Craig at once began developing the land for sale. Cooper laid out Cooperstown, built Otsego Hall, and made a fortune from the sale of his land to settlers from New England. His *Guide in the Wilderness*, intended to be a treatise on the most-approved methods of settling virgin country, is a record of his successful methods. In 1790 Cooper moved his family from Burlington and made his permanent home at Cooperstown. Many years later, his son, James Fenimore Cooper, was to romanticize the region in novels and tales of frontier life.

[A. T. Volwiler, George Croghan and the Development of Central New York, 1763-1800, in *The Quarterly Journal of the N. Y. State Hist. Assn.*, IV, 21.]

A. C. FLICK

Ottawa Indians are members of the Algonquian family, probably related to the Chippewa and Potawatomi tribes^o. Great traders, they came early on the Ottawa River to the French settlements. Friendly with whites and Hurons^o, when the latter were defeated by the Iroquois^o, 1648-49, the Ottawa with the survivors joined the Potawatomi at Green Bay. Later, still traveling west, the Sioux^o drove them back into Michigan where, except for bands moved westward in 1832 (*see* Indian Removal), most of them remained.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians.*]

JOHN FRANCIS, JR.

Ouiatenon, Fort, was first established by the French in 1720 on the north bank of the Wabash River near present Lafayette, Ind. It was a transfer point on the fur-trading route from Post Miami (Ft. Wayne) to Vincennes and Kaskaskia^o. It lost its significance as a transfer point and fur-trading center after the Revolutionary War, and in 1791 was abandoned.

[L. Esarey, *History of Indiana.*]

THEODORE G. GRONERT

"Our Country, Right or Wrong." At a dinner in his honor at Norfolk, Va., April 4, 1816, Stephen Decatur offered the following toast "Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right and always successful, right or wrong." This toast, popularly incorrectly quoted, was a reflection of the development of nationalism incident to the War of 1812.

[Charles Lee Lewis, *The Romantic Decatur; The Norfolk Beacon*, April 5, 1816.]

CHARLES LEE LEWIS

"Our Federal Union! It must and shall be preserved!" President Jackson's volunteer toast at the Jefferson anniversary dinner, April 13, 1830, was a rejoinder to previous speakers who had eulogized states' rights^o and hinted at disunion. Delivered in a most dramatic setting, with John C. Calhoun the exponent of nullification^o at the table, and described by onlookers as ringing through the banquet hall like one of the old warrior's strident commands on the field of battle, it not only clarified the position of the Chief Executive on the nullification question but served to strengthen the hearts of Unionists throughout the nation. It unquestionably contributed to the successful meeting of the ominous crisis of 1833 (*see* Force Acts).

[J. S. Bassett, *Life of Andrew Jackson.*]

W. A. ROBINSON

Outlaws. See Bandits.

Overland Companies, or Overland Emigrant Companies, were composed of groups of families who traveled from points east of the Mississippi River to the Pacific coast, usually Oregon or California, by wagon train, across country, as opposed to those who went by ship around Cape Horn^{er} or by the Isthmus of Darien.

The first of the large overland movements was the "Great Migration of 1843" to Oregon which established the Oregon Trail^{er}. The second large movement was the California gold rush^{er} of 1849. A company was usually organized among a group of friendly families although sometimes others unattached were accepted into membership. Rules to regulate the movement of the train and the action of individuals were drawn up and accepted before the start. One of the members, usually the most influential man, was elected captain; he had as much authority as a sea or army captain in making and enforcing the orders of the day. A council of ten or twelve older men was sometimes chosen for policy making; other active younger men were appointed hunters to supply the party with meat. All able-bodied men were regarded as a standing army if defense against an Indian attack was necessary.

[S. Dumbar, *History of Travel in America.*]

CARL L. CANNON

Overland Express. See Pony Express, The.

Overland Freighting (1850-70). Before the railroads were built, a large portion of the freight was carried by wagons. More specifically the term "Overland Freighting" has been applied to the carrying industry on the Overland Trail^{er} from points on the Missouri River to the Rocky Mountains or California.

As soon as Salt Lake City was founded and gold discovered in California, a certain amount of hauling began. This was greatly increased during the campaign of Gen. Johnston against the Mormons^{er} and the discovery of gold in Colorado in the late 1850's (see Pikes Peak Gold Rush). Large outfitting towns along the Missouri River (see Independence, Mo.) were the eastern termini of the freighting routes which for the most part ran up the Platte Valley or the Kansas Valley to the Rocky Mountains.

Large freighting companies were established to take care of this business. The best known of these was the firm of Russell, Majors and Waddell^{er}, which started from Atchison and Leavenworth, Kans., St. Joseph, Mo., and Nebraska City, Nebr. At the outfitting town there were

Overland Freighting

acres of wagons, huge herds of oxen, great pyramids of extra axletrees and battalions of drivers and other employees. In 1859 this firm alone used 45,000 oxen and from April 25 to Oct. 13, 1860, shipped from Nebraska City 2,782,258 pounds of freight. There were many other, both large and small, concerns in the business. Even pioneer farmers with one or two wagons sought a share of the lucrative business. In 1864 an army officer estimated that for several months during the summer no less than 1000 tons of merchandise a day poured into Denver, Colo.

Russell, Majors and Waddell ran twenty-six wagons in a train with an average load of 6000 pounds each. Each wagon was drawn by six yoke of oxen. The train was presided over by the wagon boss. An assistant boss, a night herder, a man to drive the extra animals and a spare driver or two brought the number of men in a train up to at least thirty-one. Their covered wagons^{er} strung out in line of travel like a fleet of ships with their white sails unfurled. The wagon master was admiral of this little fleet, and his word was law. He rode ahead, directed the course, selected a camp site and started and stopped the train. He and his assistant were on hand at once when one of the wagons had trouble.

It was customary to rise at three in the morning, get onto the road early, and drive until ten, when breakfast was eaten. The oxen were then allowed to rest until afternoon when a second drive was made. The train averaged from twelve to fifteen miles a day. When it reached the bed-ground, the boss directed the "bullwhackers," as the drivers were called, in forming an elliptical corral with their wagons.

The time required for a trip from Kansas City to Salt Lake City was about fifty days; the return trip was made in about forty. The freight rate differed with the season and danger from Indians.

Some freighting concerns used mule teams. In 1860 a "steam wagon," made on the order of a modern steam tractor, was tried out at Nebraska City, Nebr., with the idea of hauling freight overland, but its great weight, its imperfect mechanism, and the difficulty with which fuel could be secured for it, caused its promoters to abandon the plan. As the railroads were built across the plains the freighting outfits continued to operate over the gradually narrowing gap until finally the railroad usurped their prerogative.

[Alexander Majors, *Seventy Years on the Frontier*; Henry Inman, *The Great Salt Lake Trail.*]

EVERETT DICK

Overland Mail and Stagecoaches followed the covered wagon^o into the trans-Missouri West. Monthly government mail services were established from Independence, Mo., to Santa Fé and to Salt Lake City in 1850. Thirty days were allowed for the one-way trip on each line. A similar service was begun between Salt Lake City and Sacramento, Calif., in 1851. With small remuneration, but one team was usually used for the trip and no way stations were maintained. With such facilities, practically all mail for California went by steamer, via Panama, with a thirty-day schedule from New York to San Francisco.

Proponents of overland service advocated an adequate subsidy for the maintenance of stations and changes of teams. They finally pushed their bill through Congress. Under it, the semiweekly Southern, or Butterfield, Overland Mail^o on a twenty-five day schedule was inaugurated in 1858. The choice of a southern route, via El Paso and Tucson, angered proponents of the central route (via Salt Lake City). The Postmaster General defended the southern route as the only one feasible for year-round travel. To disprove this, the Pony Express^o was established on the central route (1860) by the contractors carrying the semimonthly stagecoach mail on this road.

With the outbreak of the Civil War the Southern Overland Mail was removed to the central route, in Union-controlled territory, and was made a daily service (see Central Overland California and Pikes Peak Express). Coaches were to carry the letter mail from the Missouri River to California in twenty days, other mail in thirty-five days. The contract provided annual compensation of \$1,000,000. Ben Holladay^o purchased the line and contract in 1862. A vigorous organizer, he quickly improved the line, extended branches to Oregon and Montana, and earned the appellation, "The Napoleon of the Plains." Indians interrupted the coaches and destroyed many stations in 1864, but the distribution of additional soldiers cleared the road. Wells Fargo^o purchased Holladay's lines in 1866 and continued operations until completion of the first trans-continental railroad (see Union Pacific Railroad). Coaches continued for many years to serve localities not reached by rail.

The Concord^o stagecoach, manufactured by Abbot-Downing of Concord, N. H., was the great overland carrier of passengers, mail and express before 1869. It was swung on leather thorobridges in lieu of springs, and accommodated nine inside passengers and others on the top. Leather boots at front and rear carried the mail and express. The coach was drawn by four or six horses or

mules, and usually made 100 miles in twenty-four hours. The driver was the lion of the road, the only one, as Mark Twain on his stage trips says, "they bowed down to and worshipped." His fancy whip was his pride. The stagecoach was a symbol and an institution of the prerailroad West.

[L. R. Hafen, *The Overland Mail, 1849-1869.*]

LEROY R. HAFEN

Overland Trail or Route, THE, was a variation of the Oregon Trail^o, being a short route from near the forks of the Platte to Fort Bridger^o, Wyo. It was popularized and named in 1862 when Ben Holladay's Overland Stage Line^o was moved to it from the old emigrant road along the North Platte. Shorter distance and less Indian danger induced the change of stage route. The Overland Trail followed the south bank of the South Platte to Latham, near present Greeley, Colo., up the Cache la Poudre, across the Laramie Plains, over Bridger Pass and thence west to Fort Bridger. Its route west of Latham was previously called the "Cherokee Trail,"^o having been traversed by Cherokee goldseekers in 1849. The Lincoln Highway and the Union Pacific Railroad approximately follow the Overland Trail through western Wyoming. Some emigrants used this trail in the middle 1860's, but it was never so popular as the older route, the Oregon Trail.

[L. R. Hafen, *The Overland Mail, 1849-1869.*]

LEROY R. HAFEN

Overseer was the title given the general manager of a large agricultural unit in the antebellum South. Upon him depended the smooth and efficient operation of the plantation^o. It was his duty to maintain discipline, divide the labor, issue all supplies, care for the livestock, keep all tools and buildings in repair and harvest the crops. His annual salary might range from \$120, or less, to \$1500, depending upon the locality, individual ability and integrity, etc. The typical overseer was a native Southerner, half-literate, crude and mediocre in ability, scorned by his employer and the slaves subject to his control.

[U. B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South.*]

RALPH B. FLANDERS

Owen, Fort. Maj. John Owen built his trading post and stockade on the Bitter Root River, Montana, in 1851, adjacent to the site of St. Mary's Jesuit Mission to the Flathead Indians^o. In 1874 Owen was taken to an insane asylum, his post was closed and became dilapidated. It

was repaired in 1876 to serve as a refuge for settlers during an Indian outbreak, then abandoned again and fell into ruin.

[Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., *The Jesuits of the Middle United States; The Journals and Letters of Major John Owen*, ed. by Dunbar and Phillips.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Owenites. See New Harmony Settlement, The.

Oxen were used from the time of the early settlements in America as draft animals and for plowing. Their slowness of pace was counterbalanced on rough, muddy pioneer roads by their great superiority to the horse in strength and endurance. They were used in logging and in early canal and railroad building. On the Middlesex Canal^o in Massachusetts, about 1805, one yoke (two) of them, in a test, drew a raft containing 800 tons of timber, but at the rate of only one mile per hour, which was considered too slow to be permitted on the towpath. During the 19th century, the small farmers, white and colored, in the South, were happy to have a yoke of "steers," or even one steer for general use, and an occasional one might be found working there as late as the third decade of the 20th century. Oxen drew many of the household wagons of the pioneers in all the great westward migrations—to the Ohio country, to Tennessee, Kentucky, to the prairie states, and finally, in 1848–49, on the long treks over plains and mountains to Oregon and California. Next they were employed in enormous numbers for freighting in the West. Two large loaded wagons were often hooked together and drawn over rough trails by six, eight or ten yoke of oxen. Several rigs of this sort, traveling together for safety, were called, in western parlance, a "bull train." Russell, Majors and Waddell^o, while they were hauling supplies for the army from the Missouri River to Utah in 1857–58 (see Mormon War), are said to have worked 40,000 oxen and only 1000 mules. When the gold rush to the Black Hills^o began in 1875, one company, freighting from Sioux City, Iowa, to Deadwood, S. D., used from 2000 to 3000 oxen and 1000 to 1500 mules. Another concern, operating between Yankton and Deadwood, was working 4000 oxen at the height of the rush.

[Ezra Meeker, *The Ox Team, or the Old Oregon Trail*; Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Waybills*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Oxford Movement, THE, also called the Tractarian Movement, was a religious revival begun in 1833 in the Church of England, which emphasized the Catholic heritage of the Anglican communion in its doctrine, polity and worship.

In America, where it was commonly called Puseyism, the movement found congenial soil in circles of the Episcopal Church already influenced by the High Churchmanship of Bishop Hobart of New York (1811–30), particularly in the General Seminary in New York City. Opposition by those who believed the movement endangered the Protestantism of the church reached considerable proportions during the 1840's, but efforts to obtain a condemnation of Tractarianism by the General Convention of 1844 were unsuccessful. Several conversions to Roman Catholicism, notably Bishop Ives of North Carolina in 1852, increased party tension. In the decade following the Civil War controversy centered about ceremonial innovations by the Anglo-Catholics; and the General Convention of 1874 passed a canon designed to prevent liturgical practices inconsistent with the church's doctrines. Nonetheless, the movement has exercised a permanent influence throughout the Episcopal Church, and even in other denominations, both as to the external ceremonial of the liturgy and in a larger emphasis upon the sacramental forms of religious devotion.

[W. W. Manross, *A History of the American Episcopal Church*.]

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

Oyster River Raid, THE, occurred July 18, 1894, when an Indian war party, recruited in Maine and accompanied by several Frenchmen, surprised the settlement on Oyster River in the town of Dover, N. H. A few garrison houses were successfully defended, but ninety-four persons were killed or captured.

[J. Scales, *The Oyster River Massacre*, in *Proceedings of the New Hampshire Historical Society*, Vol. V.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Ozarks, Prehistoric Indian Life in the. Hundreds of low, circular, irregularly grouped mounds scattered widely throughout the Ozarks give abundant evidence of a large settlement of the prehistoric Mound Builders^o. From causes unknown these people completely disappeared.

[Louis Houck, *A History of Missouri*, Vol. I; Grant Foreman, *Indians and Pioneers*.]

GLENN H. BENTON

Pacific Cable. During the latter part of the 19th century various projects for a transpacific cable were suggested. In 1902 the cable of the Pacific Cable Board was laid between Bamfield (Victoria Island, British Columbia) and Southport (Queensland, Australia). The following year the first section of the line, constructed by the Commercial Pacific Cable Company from San Francisco to Honolulu, was opened. The entire cable reaching Manila and Shanghai was

soon completed with connections to the Japanese cable which terminated in Yokohama.

[Leslie Bennett Tribolet, *The International Aspects of Electrical Communications in the Pacific Area*, Johns Hopkins University Series in Historical and Political Science, Extra Volumes, New Series, No. 4, 1929]

I. HOWELL KANE

Pacific Coast, Fake Exploration of the. The first individuals to attain fame in connection with the Pacific coast of the United States were the fakers: authentic persons (with one exception) who professed to have made miraculous discoveries; men who found inlets and passages where none existed or located real ones, without going thither, by means of dynamic imaginations not bestowed upon lesser mortals. The earliest of these supernatural beings was Capt. Lorenzo Ferrer Maldonado, who declared that in 1588 he voyaged in high latitudes from the Atlantic Ocean through a strait into a large sea, then through another strait that debouched upon the western coast of the North American continent.

In April, 1596, Michael Lok, English merchant, encountered in Venice one Juan deFuca, a Greek whose real name was Apostolos Valerianos, who said that he had been for some years a mariner and pilot in the service of Spain. He claimed that in 1592 he made a voyage along the Pacific coast during which he discovered the strait that now bears his name. Since the strait really exists many persons to this day claim that deFuca really made the voyage.

The most colorful of the pretenders was Admiral Bartholomew deFonte, whose person and deeds seem to have been created by James Petiver, London author. In the issues for April and June, 1708, of the *Monthly Miscellany, or Memoirs for the Curious*, published in London, appeared what purported to be a letter from de Fonte, alleged admiral of Spain, written many decades earlier. In the letter deFonte claimed that he sailed north from Callao, Peru, on April 3, 1640, and at the fifty-third parallel, north latitude, discovered a great river. He ascended the river to a lake, where he left his ships and by boat descended a river flowing eastward and at last came to the Atlantic Ocean, where he found a Boston vessel at anchor! Publication of the letter created a storm that endured through several decades.

[Samuel Purchas, *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, London, 1625, Vol. III; James Burney, *A Chronological History of the Voyages and Discoveries in the South Sea or Pacific Ocean*, London, 1813, Vol. III; H. R. Wagner, *Apocryphal Voyages to the Northwest Coast of America, Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, April, 1931.]

FRANK EDWARD ROSS

Pacific Fur Company, THE, organized by John Jacob Astor in 1810, was the western subsidiary of his American Fur Company^c. By the combined work of these two companies he hoped to control the American fur market. Astor supplied capital up to \$400,000 and was to bear any losses for the first five years. He retained 50% of the stock and prorated the remainder among his field partners. Alexander Mackay, Duncan McDougall, Donald McKenzie, David Stuart and Wilson Price Hunt, all former North West Fur Company^m men except Hunt, were the chief partners. The plan of operations called for the chief depot, Astoria^m, at the mouth of the Columbia River, at which point the sea otter^m pelts, gathered in coasting trade, and beaver pelts from the interior, would be made ready for shipment. Vessels from the East coast would bring supplies to Astoria and then carry the pelts to Canton^m and return to the United States with a cargo of Chinese goods (see China Trade). There was also to be a chain of posts along the Columbia-Missouri river route to the United States. The wreck of two of the ships, unfortunate management in the field, and the War of 1812^m resulted in the failure of the Pacific Fur Company, and Astoria and its equipment was sold by the field partners, at a great sacrifice, to the North West Fur Company.

[George W. Fuller, *A History of the Pacific Northwest*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Pacific Islands. The United States, with a view to future commercial and strategic purposes, began acquiring Pacific islands in the 19th century.

In 1867 the Midway Islands were occupied and the Aleutian Islands^m purchased (see Alaska). In 1898 Spain ceded the Philippines and Guam^m largest of the Marianas group (225 square miles). In 1898 after years of official and unofficial American penetration, the Hawaiian^m Archipelago was annexed. In 1899 Wake Island^m, a coral atoll in mid-Pacific and claimed by Wilkes^m in 1841, was formally annexed. In 1899 the Samoan Islands^m east of longitude 171° were acquired. By executive order, May 13, 1936, Jarvis, Baker and Howland^m were annexed. These equatorial islets, located on a course to Australia, Samoa and Hawaii, are potentially important in the development of air routes. In 1938 an executive order assigned to the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, Canton and Enderbury in mid-Pacific, valuable seaplane bases in the Pacific. England who claims these equatorial islands within her sphere of influence has challenged American annexation. The United States claims them by virtue of their discovery by Americans in the

19th century. The Pacific islands are intended to serve not only as naval and commercial air bases but also for defense, forming vital links in a line stretching from the Aleutian Islands to Hawaii, Panama and Samoa.

[Guy H. Scholefield, *The Pacific: Its Past and Future*; James Morton Callahan, *American Relations in the Pacific and the Far East, 1784-1900*; Alden P. Armagnac, *Uncle Sam's New Ocean Empire*, in *Popular Science Monthly*, Vol. 132, No. 4.]

J. W. ELLISON

Pacific Northwest, THE, comprising the states of Oregon, Washington and Idaho, constitutes a well-defined geographical unit. This unity is emphasized by close economic ties and the common historical heritage of all being part of Old Oregon. The section is best referred to as the Pacific Northwest to avoid confusion in titles and references dealing with the Old Northwest^o, the country of the Ohio and Great Lakes region.

[Dan Elbert Clark, *The West in American History*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Pacific Ocean, THE, engaged the attention of American statesmen long before the territorial limits of the United States extended to its shores. The opening of commerce with China in the first years after the Revolution, the development of the fur trade of the Northwest coast (*see* China Trade), and the voyages about Cape Horn of American whalers^o, served to awaken an early ambition for American supremacy in this vast ocean area in order to maintain the sea routes to the trade of the Far East. Before the westward trek to Oregon and California, a strong feeling had thus developed that the United States should have ports and harbors on the West coast to enable it to forestall British efforts "to fence us out from the Pacific Ocean, to belt us about, yet more closely, with her kingly despotism." The westward movement^o naturally re-enforced this feeling, and President Polk's interest in the ports of Oregon and in the acquisition of San Francisco Bay reveal how strong a part our position in the Pacific played in his conception of our manifest destiny^o. The abortive movement for annexation of the Hawaiian Islands in the 1850's and Commodore Perry's expedition to Japan^o further illustrate national interest at this time in what Sen. Seward eloquently declared would be the "chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter."

With the Civil War and subsequent concentration upon problems nearer home, the further advance of American interests in the Pacific was relegated to the background until the close of the 19th century. Alaska^o was purchased, pri-

Pacific Republic Movement

marily as an outpost in the Pacific; certain rights were asserted in Samoa^o; and the Hawaiian Islands were brought more closely under American domination; but it took the events of the Spanish-American War^o to set in motion forces which had been generally slumbering since the decade of the 1850's. Then it was that the almost fortuitous conquest of the Philippine Islands^o was responsible for a new wave of imperialism which had the establishment of paramount American influence in the Pacific as its primary objective. Not only were the Philippines taken over from Spain but Hawaii was annexed and title asserted to one of the Samoan Islands. "The Pacific is our ocean, . . ." Sen. Beveridge declared in flamboyant expression of the triumphant imperialism of 1900, "and the Pacific is the ocean of the commerce of the future. Most future wars will be conflicts for commerce. The Power that rules the Pacific, therefore, is the Power that rules the world."

With the rise of an imperialistic Japan intent upon domination of the Western Pacific, the ideas so popular at the opening of the century have been rudely shattered. But without submitting the issue to the arbitrament of war, the United States has nevertheless vigorously endeavored to uphold its position in the Pacific and to keep open the trade routes to the Far East. The Washington Naval Conference^o, in 1921-22, with its naval accords and agreement for the maintenance of the status quo in respect to insular possessions, was an attempt to substitute for the existing political and naval rivalry between Japan and the United States a new order in Pacific affairs based on goodwill and collective security. And while a less aggressive assertion of our rights in the Far East, following the collapse of the Washington Conference accords, and the undertaking to grant the Philippines their independence, would appear to symbolize an abandonment of the imperialistic ambitions of the 19th century, continued insistence upon naval superiority over Japan and the development of air routes to the Far East (*see* China Clipper) demonstrate a continued belief in the importance of the Pacific Ocean in our national development.

[Foster Rhea Dulles, *America in the Pacific*.]

FOSTER RHEA DULLES

Pacific Railroad. *See* Union Pacific Railroad.

Pacific Republic Movement, THE, looking toward the separation of the region west of the Rockies into one or more independent states, was especially active on the eve of secession and during the first year of the Civil War (1855-62), but

was talked of by Oregon Democrats when obliged to submit to the rule of Whig officials (1849-53) and by the people of California when Congress delayed admission of their state to the Union (1848-50). Congressmen from Oregon and California, among them Senators Lane, Gwin and Latham, were charged with a plot to establish a Pacific Republic, and it was advocated by pro-Southern newspapers in these states, such as the *Portland Standard*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Sonora Democrat* and the *Los Angeles Star*. The Knights of the Golden Circle⁷, a secret organization of Southern sympathizers, took an oath to support a Pacific Coast Republic and are said to have plotted to seize customhouses and arsenals. It was urged that by the establishment of an independent republic, participation in the fratricidal strife between North and South could be avoided.

[Dorothy Hull, The Movement in Oregon for the Establishment of a Pacific Coast Republic, in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, XVII, Joseph Ellison, The Sentiment for a Pacific Republic, in *Proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch of Amer. Hist. Assoc.*, 1929.]

R. C. CLARK

"Pacificus" and "Helvidius." On April 22, 1793, Washington issued the Proclamation of Neutrality⁸ designed to keep the United States out of the war between Great Britain and France. The proclamation was defended by Alexander Hamilton in a series of articles under the pseudonym of "Pacificus" in the *Gazette of the United States* (June 29-July 27, 1793) James Madison as "Helvidius" replied to these in a series of letters in the same paper (Aug. 24-Sept. 18, 1793).

[L. M. Sears, *A History of American Foreign Relations*.]

STANLEY R. PILLSBURY

Pacifism. Although at all times a relatively small number of Americans adhered to pacifism (the uncompromising opposition to all war), this ethical conviction has been a force of some importance in American history. Pacifism has had its chief exemplars in Quakers, Mennonites⁹ and other nonresistant sects; in the 20th century the influence of Tolstoy and Gandhi somewhat enlarged the pacifist circle.

In the sphere of practical action it is difficult to evaluate the contributions of pacifism. Until the middle of the 18th century the Pennsylvania Quakers demonstrated the efficacy of pacifist principles in dealing with Indians; and during the administration of President Grant, Quaker agents won official praise for their success in administering the new peace policy adopted toward the aborigines. While some leading Americans, notably Garrison, Sumner and Bryan, espoused

pacifism during portions of their careers, the influence of pacifism has been for the most part indirect and difficult to measure. A great majority of Quakers and members of other nonresistant sects, and a minority of members of the peace societies which have enjoyed a continuous history since the War of 1812, refused to surrender their absolute opposition to war when the nation embarked on that course. Their steadfast adherence to their convictions enabled them to criticize the objectives of a war during the course of the struggle, and the record of their sacrifices for an ideal is a tribute to the vitality of ethical individualism.

During the period of "preparedness"¹⁰ prior to American entrance into the World War the term "pacifist" became one of opprobrium. After the armistice, conservative patriots denounced pacifism and associated it with revolutionary and radical activity. Nevertheless, disillusionment with war as an instrument for effecting peace, justice and democracy accounted for the growth of pacifism within the organized movement against war. While some absolute pacifists advocated international co-operation and collective security, they tended, increasingly in the 1920's and 1930's, to favor rigid neutrality and isolation.

[Merle Curti, *Peace or War: The American Struggle, 1636-1936*; C. M. Case, *Non-Violent Coercion*; Devere Allen, *The Fight for Peace*.]

MERLE CURTI

Pack Trains. For the conversion of Western products into the indispensable articles which the trans-Allegheny pioneers could not wrest from their environment, caravans of pack horses were the means of transport. After crops were secured in autumn, the neighbors of a frontier community organized a pack train. Each horse was girthed with a wooden packsaddle and laden with goods for barter—mainly peltry, some ginseng, potash, flax, whiskey. Feed also was carried, part to be cached in the mountains for the return journey. The string of customarily ten to twenty horses, under command of a master driver and two or three "understrappers," followed usually an old Indian trail; the belled horses plodded in single file some fifteen to twenty-five miles before they were hobbled for the night's bivouac. The main Pennsylvania trails were the Kittanning from the Allegheny River down the Juniata Valley, and the Raystown Path¹¹ from the Ohio to the Eastern cities; on the main southerly route Baltimore, the earliest depot, was replaced as trading spread farther west by Frederick, Hagerstown and Cumberland. The pack trains returned with salt, iron, sugar, lead, per-

haps some urban "luxuries" such as crockery.

From its communal beginnings, packing became a professional vocation. Widening of the trails to permit wagon passage, James O'Hara's enterprise in bringing salt down the Allegheny River to Pittsburgh, and the safety of keelboat⁷⁷ transportation on the Ohio after 1795, pushed the primitive pack trains into farther frontiers. They shared the Santa Fé Trail⁷⁸ with freighters' wagons, served remote fur-trading and mining posts, and were much used by troops operating against hostile Indians.

[W. C. Langdon, *Everyday Things in American Life*.]

E. DOUGLAS BRANCH

Packaging. In the early days of mass production⁷⁹, goods were usually produced, shipped and sold in bulk in carloads, hogsheads, barrels, boxes, or sacks. Consumers' goods were weighed and measured by retailers and done up in wrapping paper. Modern packaging began in the late 1890's. The "Uneda" cracker package, introduced in 1899, marked the beginning of the end of the sale of crackers in bulk from barrel or box. Gradually, more and more consumer goods were packed in suitable containers featuring brand names.

From 1920 onward, packaging increased in importance not only in consumer goods but also in industrial goods. Competition for markets led to economies in transportation costs through the use of lighter packing materials, packaging to eliminate wastes and losses, and packaging to enhance saleability. Great savings have been effected in recent years, not only through improvement of traditional packing materials, but also in the invention of new materials and processes. Fiber and corrugated cases have been widely extended in use, plywood has in many cases taken the place of lumber, and plastics of various kinds have been developed for the finer products.

[C. B. Larrabee, *How to Package for Profit*; American Management Association, *Packaging, Packing and Shipping*.]

PAUL H. NYSTROM

Packers' Agreement. The investigation of the meat packing industry begun in 1917 by the Federal Government resulted in the exposure of monopoly and unfair practices. Public opinion forced the larger packers in 1920 to agree voluntarily with the Government to sell all holdings in public stockyards, stockyard railroads, cold storage warehouses and terminals, dispose of their interests in all market newspapers, give up the selling of all products unrelated to the meat industry, abandon the use of all transportation facilities for the carrying of any but their own

products, and submit to Federal injunction forbidding monopoly.

[R. A. Clemen, *The American Livestock and Meat Industry*; Lewis H. Haney, *The Case against the Meat Packers*; William B. Colver, Federal Trade Commission and the Meat Packing Industry, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March, 1919.]

ERNEST S. OSGOOD

Packers and Stockyards Act, THE, passed in August, 1921, after several years of controversy, made it unlawful for packers to manipulate prices, to create monopoly, and to award favors to any person or locality. The regulation of stockyards⁸⁰ provided for nondiscriminatory services, reasonable rates, open schedules and fair charges. The administration of the law was under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture who entertained complaints, held hearings and issued "cease and desist" orders. The bill was a significant part of the agrarian legislation of the early 1920's.

[U. S. Statutes at Large, 67th Cong., pp. 159-169; A. Capper, *The Agricultural Bloc*.]

THOMAS S. BARCLAY

Packets, Sailing. The packet proper, or sailing liner, as distinguished from the "regular trader" and the transient or tramp, was one of a line of privately owned vessels, sailing in regular succession on fixed dates between specified ports; it rendered a service later continued by the steamship lines. The New York packets in their day served as the chief link between the Old World and the New; played an essential part in attracting the movements of commerce toward New York; demonstrated the value of line arrangement; and incidentally made more money than most clippers or whalers⁸¹. Nor was adventure lacking in their grim assignment, driven to the limit through ocean gales at all seasons.

The British government mail brigs, which carried no freight, and local New York steamers were partial precedents for the Black Ball Line⁸² which began monthly service between New York and Liverpool in 1818. By 1822 the Red Star Line, the Blue Swallowtail Line, and doubled Black Ball service gave weekly sailings between the two ports, augmented later by the Dramatic Line and "New Line." Meanwhile New York inaugurated similar service with London and Havre between 1822 and 1824. Rival efforts of Philadelphia, Boston and Baltimore met with slight success.

The history of these New York ocean packets falls into three periods of some twenty years each. Until 1838 their functional importance was at its

height, for they conveyed most of the news, cabin passengers, and "fine freight" between Europe and America. During the next twenty years, with steamships cutting into those lucrative fields, they changed to the immigrant business; but the ships themselves increased in size and in speed until the mid-1850's. In their later years, losing even the steerage trade, they became mere freighters on schedule. The last ocean packet sailing was made in 1881.

The packet principle was successfully extended to coastal runs. By 1826 lines of full-rigged ships were connecting New York with the cotton ports, while lesser lines of brigs or schooners plied other coastal runs. The former group brought cotton to New York for shipment to Europe and helped to distribute New York's imports.

[R. G. Albion, *Square-Riggers on Schedule: The New York Sailing Packets to England, France, and the Cotton Ports.*]

ROBERT G. ALBION

Packing, Meat, began as an industry in the colonies. Although local in character, an expanding export trade, principally to the West Indies, gave an added impetus to the business. Meat was preserved by packing it in snow or by a process of salt-pickling, dry-salting, or smoking. And when meat was pickled and packed in barrels for shipment, the term packing came to be applied to the entire process.

Until the industry moved west with the frontier, meat packing "remained dispersed in both organization and geography." Before the advent of efficient transportation, centralized slaughtering points and agricultural fairs developed. To these centers cattle were driven oftentimes by professional drivers. However, the cattle lost weight in traveling and as a result slaughtering points near the meat-raising areas came into being.

In the early 1830's Cincinnati was the center of the packing business. Because of its trade in hogs, the city came to be known as "Porkopolis." Writing of this center on Dec. 2, 1852, the editor of the *Chicago Tribune* said: "What it has attained in reference to Pork, Chicago is rapidly becoming in regard to Beef." At seven establishments 21,777 cattle had been slaughtered during the 1852 season—a development which was phenomenal since it was "only about a half dozen years" since beef packing had been inaugurated at Chicago "on an extensive scale."

Although packing and slaughtering had been a single process at an earlier period, it was during the decade of the Civil War that the industry became two separate activities. Following this period there was a rapid increase in the

scope of the meat-packing business. Two principal factors contributed to the growth of the industry: the development of transportation and the perfection of refrigeration²⁰. Chicago, close to consumer markets and destined as a waterway and railway center, soon came to be the focal point of the packing trade. Men of European experience like W. P. Sinclair, Samuel Kingan and Jacob Dold, and men of Middle West experience like Philip D. Armour, Gustavus F. Swift, A. A. Libby and John Cudahy, all set up business in Chicago.

Another important factor in the trend toward concentration was the need for a large amount of capital. When slaughtering and selling were carried on by commission merchants, only a small financial outlay was required. But when this seasonal industry became a single process, the delay between the purchase of cattle and the sale of the finished product necessitated the use of large sums of money. This concentration has organized meat packing into three functions: slaughtering and packing; by-products; and storage and distribution. However, there have been forces opposed to unlimited concentration. Marketing and freight costs as well as the local character of packing and slaughtering have led many to believe that a proportion of the business will always be carried on by small private concerns.

About 1875 the practicability of artificial refrigeration was demonstrated, and five years later the development of dressed beef added to the growth of the meat-packing business. This utilization of fresh beef stimulated the organization of packing centers farther west, at such places as Kansas City, Omaha, Sioux City, St. Louis, St. Joseph and St. Paul.

Near the end of the 19th century "tainted beef" led to a demand for the regulation of the meat-packing industry; and by 1906 Congress enacted a comprehensive statute regulating the business. Since that time packing has been subject to some measure of governmental control (*see Packers and Stockyards Act*).

The World War had a significant effect on the packing business. A large demand for canned meat for the army did much to stimulate the industry. America becoming the food center of the world carried with it the increase of cattle production. This overexpansion during the World War years resulted in subsequent maladjustments in agriculture and companion repercussions in meat packing.

Significant, too, in the history of the packing business, has been the standardization of railroad rates and the stabilization of the measurements of grain. For example, the Chicago Board of

Trade has done much to make its city a center of the agricultural trade. Meat packing has developed from subsidiary as well as immediate causes.

According to the census in 1869 there were 768 meat-packing establishments in the United States; twenty years later the number approximated a total of 1118; and during the 1920's a peak of over 1200 was reached. From 1869 to 1929 the value of the meat products increased from \$75,000,000 annually to approximately \$3,000,000,000 annually. The rapid development of the business since 1900 has been brought about by technical advance in methods of distribution and the production of by-products. A high degree of specialization and a utilization of a division of labor have added to the concentration and the advancement of the meat-packing industry.

[V. S. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States*; R. A. Clemen, *The American Livestock and Meat Industry*; H. C. Hill, *The Development of Chicago as a Center of the Meat Packing Industry*, in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. X.]

BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH

Padlock Injunctions. The use of the usual processes of the criminal law is often insufficient to abate a public nuisance such as a gambling den or house of ill fame. In such cases the courts may issue an order to the police to padlock the premises, protecting the lock against molestation by an injunction. Then any one who tampers with the lock is in contempt of court and is punished accordingly. The padlock injunction was used extensively during national prohibition to close permanently premises used for bootlegging⁷⁸. If the owner of the property can prove that he had no knowledge of the illegal use to which it was put, the injunction is usually dissolved.

[F. R. Aumann, *Where to with Criminal Equity*, in *American Law Review*, Vol. LXII, No. 3.]

HARVEY WALKER

Padoucahs, or Padducas, was a name applied by early explorers to the Comanches⁷⁹.

Painting. See Art.

"Pairing," a practice whereby two members of opposing parties who plan to be absent agree that, during a specified period, they will refrain from voting in person, but will permit their names to be recorded on opposite sides of each question, appeared in the national House of Representatives as early as 1824, was first openly avowed in 1840, but not officially recognized in

Palatine Jurisdictions

the Rules until 1880. Pairing is also permitted in the Senate, and is customary, though not universal, in state legislatures.

[House Rule IX; H. Walker, *Law-Making in the United States*; R. Luce, *Legislative Procedure*.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Paiutes, THE, sometimes known as Pah-Utes, are difficult to identify because the name has been used by different writers to designate most of the Shoshonean tribes of western Utah, northern Arizona, southern Idaho, eastern Oregon, Nevada, and eastern and southern California. The great majority of the Paiutes are not on reservations but are attached as ranch hands to farms in their former country. Generally speaking, they have been friendly to the whites. They took part in the Bannock War⁸⁰ of 1878 against what they considered aggression.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Palatine Jurisdictions. The palatine lords of the mediæval period of European history enjoyed within their domains virtually regal authority and unusual immunities from royal interference. Of diverse origins, these palatine jurisdictions represent, among other things, a feudal solution for the problem of governing remote areas, as is suggested by the northern and western locations of the three English palatinates of Durham, Chester and Lancaster. For the American story, the Bishopric of Durham is of greatest importance. Though little of the substance of its independence remained by the 17th century, English colonizers undertook to transplant in America the system it represented. The obvious risks assumed by promoters of colonization dictated a demand for exceptional rights and powers in controlling their settlements. Where the grant was to a member of the landed classes there was a disposition to follow customary forms and define these powers in terms of feudal prerogatives. Thus, proprietary projects frequently looked to the enjoyment of jurisdictional rights similar to those of palatine lords. Several grants (notably Maryland, 1632, and Carolina, 1663-65) even stipulated that the grantees should enjoy an authority equal to that of the Bishop of Durham "at any time" theretofore. Such efforts, largely abortive but extending well into the 18th century, to transfer to America outworn feudal usages, provide a key to many troublesome chapters of colonial history.

[G. T. Lapsley, *The County Palatine of Durham*; C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, Vols. II, III.]

WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

Palatines, THE, were the Germans from the Rhenish or Lower Palatinate, who in 1708-9, because of devastation by war, religious persecution, famine, or the enticing advertisements circulated by William Penn and other colonial proprietors, made their way to England to petition for assistance from Queen Anne to settle in America. Completely dependent on the English government for subsistence, they soon became a pressing problem. In July, 1709, an abortive attempt was made to settle 794 families in Ireland, and in August of that same year a group of 600 were sent to North Carolina. By far the greater part of the refugees, however, were settled in the Hudson Valley with the expectation that they would manufacture naval stores⁷⁷, an occupation in which they were totally unexperienced. With the failure of this project many left for Pennsylvania or New Jersey; and 150 families, led by Conard Weiser, went to Schoharie, N. Y. On his arrival in 1720 Gov. Burnet was ordered to move the Palatines to the frontier, and a number of families were settled on the Mohawk near the present village of Herkimer (German Flats⁷⁸).

[Walter Knittle, *Early 18th Century Palatine Emigration*.]

A. C. FLICK

Palmer's Discovery of Antarctica. The logbook of the sloop *Hero*, a vessel of only forty-four tons burden, Capt. Nathaniel Brown Palmer master, demonstrates that Palmer, an American youth then twenty-one years of age, discovered the mainland of Antarctica on Nov. 18, 1820, eighty days before the reputed date of discovery. Three important things are proved by the logbook and contemporary documents. First, the motive for the voyage was the gathering and sale of fur-seal skins and seal oil. Secondly, Palmer discovered Port Williams (Port Foster), the breached volcanic crater in Deception Island; he explored many parts of the South Shetland Islands, including Yankee Sound (McFarlane Strait) and Yankee Harbor (Hospital Cove), making creditable maps. Most important of all, the log demonstrates that Palmer was the first person to see and to visit any part of the Antarctic mainland.

Palmer made his initial landfall at 63° 45' S. Lat. and 60° 10' W. Long. on the Palmer Peninsula, improperly called Graham Land, which, since Lincoln Ellsworth's air voyage in 1935, is known to be continental and not insular. R. T. Gould's theory that Edward Bransfield may have anticipated Palmer in seeing Antarctica is not based upon any existing logbook. Bransfield discovered Trinity Island but the third-hand record of his supposed momentary glimpse of a peak

through fog, on Jan. 31 or Feb. 1, 1820, does not necessarily involve a peak upon the Antarctic mainland rather than an iceberg or one of the islands northeast of the Palmer Peninsula. Dumont d'Urville in 1842 and Otto Nordenskjöld in 1911 both concluded that Bransfield never saw Antarctica. Palmer's landfall, on the other hand, is not nebulous, but based upon specific records. He subsequently explored other parts of the Antarctic coast going as far as Marguerite Bay in 68° S, and, jointly with Powell, discovered the South Orkney Islands.

[Edwin Swift Balch, *Stonington Antarctic Explorers, Bulletin of the American Geographical Society*, Vol. 41; *Antarctica*; and *Antarctica Addenda, Journal of Franklin Institute*, Vol. 157, Edmund Fanning, *Voyages around the World*, R. T. Gould, *The First Sighting of the Antarctic Continent, Geographical Journal*, Vol. 65; A. W. Greely, *American Discoverers of the Antarctic Continent, National Geographic Magazine*, Vol. 23; W. H. Hobbs, *The Discoveries of Antarctica within the American Sector, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New series, Vol. 31, part 1; Lawrence Martin, *The Log of Palmer's Discovery of Antarctica, Science*, New series, Vol. 87; Palmer's Instrumental Observations in Connection with the Discovery of Antarctica, *ibid.*; *An American Discovered Antarctica, International Geographical Congress*, 1938; *The Log of the Hero, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* (in press), John Randolph Spears, *Captain Nathaniel Brown Palmer, an Old-Time Sailor of the Sea*.]

LAWRENCE MARTIN

Palmetto Cockades were emblems adopted by the States' Rights party in South Carolina during the Nullification⁷⁹ controversy (1832). The cockade was in the form of a small rosette of blue ribbon upon the center of which was fastened a gilt palmetto button, and when displayed on a Nullifier's hat was not infrequently regarded by members of the opposing Union party as an invitation to a fight.

[Chauncey S. Boucher, *The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina*; J. H. Carlisle, Jr., ed., *Addresses of J. H. Carlisle*.]

JAMES W. PATTON

Palmito Ranch, The Battle of (May 13, 1865), was the last land battle of the Civil War. On May 12, Col. Theodore H. Barrett, stationed near the mouth of the Rio Grande, drove out a small group of Confederates at Palmito Ranch, twelve miles below Brownsville. The following day the Southern troops moved back into their former position with reinforcements, including six 12-pounders. Col. Barrett, unable to dislodge them, began a retreat. A three-hour running fight began in which Barrett reported a loss in killed and missing of 111 men.

[Wooten, *History of Texas*, Vol. II; Bancroft, *History of North Mexican States and Texas*.]

J. G. SMITH

Palo Alto, The Battle of (May 8, 1846), was the first battle of the Mexican War. Gen. Zachary Taylor's army of 2228 men met a Mexican force more than twice its number under Gen. Mariano Arista twelve miles northeast of the modern city of Brownsville, Tex. Almost entirely an artillery duel, it demonstrated the superiority of Taylor's cannon, strengthened American morale, and resulted in an American victory the full effect of which was not felt until the following day at Resaca de la Palma⁷⁰.

[J. H. Smith, *The War with Mexico*.]

HOLMAN HAMILTON

Pamphleteering is the carrying on of controversy by means of separately issued tracts, or pamphlets, which because of their cheapness provide a means of propagating new or unpopular ideas. English practice had established the method as effective in religious controversy, and in political contests of the Commonwealth period. Sermons, often with a political tinge, were effective as pamphlets in colonial America; and the writings of James Otis, Stephen Hopkins, John Dickinson and others debated the issue of taxation by Parliament. Leaders of the Revolution wrote many pamphlets to justify their course, and some tracts were issued by the Loyalists⁷¹; but the ablest pamphleteer of the Revolution was Thomas Paine. His *Common Sense*⁷² was one of the strongest and most effective arguments for independence, and *The Crisis*⁷³ was a powerful buttress to the morale of the patriot cause.

Issues confronting the new government, and especially the question of adopting the Federal Constitution, were freely aired in pamphlets. The newspapers carried some of the debate, such as *The Federalist*⁷⁴ papers, but John Jay, Noah Webster, Pelatiah Webster, Tench Coxe and David Ramsay wrote pamphlets in favor of adoption, while Elbridge Gerry, George Mason, Melancthon Smith, Richard Henry Lee, Luther Martin and James Iredell produced pamphlets in opposition.

Multiplication of newspapers⁷⁵ in the early national period made pamphlet warfare less common; but the pamphlet was still the recourse for the impecunious or irresponsible agitator. Religious enthusiasts, reform groups and propagators of Utopian societies or economic panaceas still found the pamphlet an effective agent. Political campaigns flooded the country with pamphlets to augment the circulation of newspapers, or to make irresponsible attacks. Toward the end of the 19th century Socialists and Populists⁷⁶ used pamphlets to gain converts; and a Free Silverite

Pan-American Conferences

produced the notorious *Coin's Financial School*⁷⁷. Government propaganda of the World War utilized the pamphlet to sustain morale or refute criticism, and pacifists⁷⁸ found it most available. As newspapers in recent times have been restrained by vested interests or fear of popular prejudice, pamphleteering continues to play an important role in political and social life, and forms a strong bulwark in the protection of the freedom of the press⁷⁹.

[Wm. MacDonald, *American Political Writing*, 1760-1789, in *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, Vol. I; P. L. Ford, *Pamphlets on the Constitution of the United States*; Mark Sullivan, *Our Times*.]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Pan-American Conferences. The Congress of Panama (1826)⁸⁰ was the first true Pan-American conference, since it included the United States. But no further meeting of all of the American nations was assembled until Secretary of State James G. Blaine, on Oct. 2, 1889, convened the First International Conference of American States, at Washington. Eighteen countries were represented and the delegates considered the promotion of continental peace, the formation of an American customs union, the establishment of steamship lines between American ports, the formulation of a uniform system of customs regulations, the adoption of a uniform system of weights and measures, the protection of property, patent rights, copyrights and trade-marks, the adoption of a common silver trade coin, and the formulation of a plan of arbitration. The delegates signed the final acts of the Conference *ad referendum*, and adjourned April 19, 1890. The most important act finally ratified provided for the establishment of a Commercial Bureau of American Republics, now called the Pan American Union⁸¹.

The Second Conference convened at Mexico City from Oct. 22, 1901, to Jan. 31, 1902. The same general topics were again considered, with the question of compulsory arbitration and adherence to the Hague Convention of 1899⁸² occupying considerable attention.

The Third Conference met at Rio de Janeiro from July 23 to Aug. 26, 1906, with a slightly modified program. On July 31 Secretary of State Root delivered a brilliant address on friendship and co-operation among the American states. The delegates agreed to recommend to the Hague Conference of 1907 the adoption of the Drago Doctrine as a part of international law⁸³.

The Fourth Conference assembled at Buenos Aires from July 12 to Aug. 30, 1910. The program was slightly modified, the exchange of uni-

versity professors recommended, and the Bureau of American Republics reorganized

The Fifth Conference, which met at Santiago, Chile, from March 25 to May 3, 1923, was considerably influenced by the World War which had prevented the convening of the Conference in 1914. The program, therefore, considered the limitation of armaments, improving trade relations, commercial aviation, prohibition, as well as previous agenda topics. Manuel Gondra, of Paraguay, proposed the establishment of commissions of inquiry to aid in settling American disputes by arbitration.

The Sixth Conference met at Havana, Cuba, from Jan. 16 to Feb. 20, 1928, with Secretary of State Hughes leading the United States delegation. During the meetings President Coolidge and Col. Lindbergh visited the Conference, and their presence tended somewhat to soften the growing tendency of the Latin-American delegates to criticize United States imperialism.

The Seventh Conference met at Montevideo from Dec. 3 to 26, 1933, with Secretary of State Hull leading the delegation of the United States. Besides considering the customary program, the delegates gave considerable thought to ways and means of establishing peace in the Chaco War between Paraguay and Bolivia. (*See also Peace Conference at Buenos Aires, 1936*)

The Eighth Conference was held at Lima²⁰, Peru, Dec. 9 to 27, 1938.

The delegates to these conferences have displayed an increasing tendency to relegate the discussion of special Pan-American problems to special congresses. Hence, in the interims between these general conferences, special assemblies of the American states have been called to consider a great variety of problems, including arbitration, international law, sanitation, health, eugenics, finance, trade, journalism, radio, child welfare, women's rights, Red Cross activities, aviation, highways, educational problems, geography and history writing, bibliography, sciences, etc. It is particularly in these special conferences that true Pan-Americanism²⁰ is being perfected.

[Seventh International Conference of American States, *Special Handbook for the Use of Delegates*.]

A. CURTIS WILGUS

Pan-American Exposition, THE, held at Buffalo, N. Y., witnessed the assassination of President William McKinley after the delivery of his Pan-American speech in the Fair's Temple of Music on Sept. 6, 1901. There had been delay in the opening, scheduled for May 1, and now came another interruption; after the funeral the exposition reopened until November. It was designed

to show the progress of a century in the New World; its cost was almost \$2,500,000. The New York State Building, an imitation of the Parthenon, now houses the Buffalo Historical Society. The exposition presented a comprehensive picture of the beauties and possibilities of modern electricity.

FRANK MCNAGHAN

Pan American Union, THE, is an official international organization of the twenty-one republics of the Western Hemisphere. It had its origin on April 14, 1890, when the first Pan-American Conference²¹ organized an International Bureau of American Republics, the name of which was changed in 1910 to Pan American Union. It has held seven conferences since the first meeting—at Mexico City (1901), Rio de Janeiro (1906), Buenos Aires (1910), Santiago (1923), Havana (1928), Montevideo (1933), and Lima (1938).

The Union has come to be something of an executive committee of the conferences. It prepares the agenda, undertakes to give effect to the conclusions of the parent gathering, arranges special Pan-American conferences, conducts special inquiries, and promotes commercial, juridical, social and cultural exchange. The Governing Board is composed of the Secretary of State of the United States and the diplomatic representatives in Washington of the various Latin-American countries. It is expressly prohibited from discussing political questions. All efforts to change the organization from a cultural and commercial movement to an American League of Nations have so far failed. Its headquarters are in the Pan American Union building at Washington, D. C.

[James Brown Scott, *International Conferences of American States*; William Menger, *Pan Americanism and the Pan American Conferences*; Samuel Guy Inman, *Latin America, Its Place in World Life*.]

SAMUEL GUY INMAN

Pan-Americanism is a movement to improve commercial and political relations among the nations of the New World. This tendency first appeared when the nations of Latin America were struggling for independence. In 1824 Simon Bolivar invited them to send delegates to a congress on the Isthmus of Panama. Though the treaties framed by this congress were not carried into force, yet it marked the emergence of a species of Pan-Americanism. Meantime, in North America, Henry Clay had been pleading eloquently for the formation of an American system of which the United States should be the center—a system which would constitute the rallying point of human freedom against the despotism

of the Old World (*see* Pan-American Conferences).

[W. S. Robertson, *Hispanic-American Relations with the United States*; J. B. Lockey, *Pan-Americanism: Its Beginnings*; S. G. Inman, *Problems in Pan Americanism*.]

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON

Panama, Declaration of, was adopted at Panama City on Oct. 3, 1939, by the "Consultative Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the American Republics." To deal with conditions created by the outbreak of war in Europe at the beginning of September, 1939, sixteen resolutions or sets of resolutions and declarations were adopted. These dealt with such matters as "Economic Cooperation," "Continental Solidarity," "Neutrality," "Humanization of War" and "Contraband of War." But the most widely publicized was No. XIV, which carried the title, "Declaration of Panama." This consisted of a preamble and four declarations. The first declaration stated that American waters should be "free from the commission of any hostile act by any non-American belligerent nation, whether such hostile act be attempted or made from land, sea or air." These waters were defined to include a strip averaging about 300 miles in width extending southward from the eastern end of the United States-Canada boundary, around South America and northward to the western end of the boundary between the United States and Canada.

In the second declaration it was stated that the Republics would attempt, "through joint representations," to secure compliance with the Declaration by the belligerents. Provision was made in the third declaration for further consultation, if necessary, to "determine upon the measures" to be undertaken "to secure the observance" of the Declaration. The fourth declaration provided for individual or collective patrols by the Republics of "the waters adjacent to their coasts" "whenever they may determine that the need therefor exists."

[*The Department of State Bulletin*, I, Oct. 7, 1939, 321-334.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Panama Canal. The idea of a transisthmian canal was first discussed soon after the discovery of America. During the early part of the 19th century there were several unsuccessful efforts to organize companies to build one, and the United States and Great Britain were involved in a number of disputes because each desired to prevent the other from controlling possible routes (*see* Clayton-Bulwer Treaty). In 1846 the United States made a treaty with New Granada (*see*

Bidlack-Mallarino Treaty of 1846), now Colombia, guaranteeing the neutrality of the Isthmus of Panama and the sovereignty of New Granada there in return for a promise of free transit across the Isthmus by any mode of communication that might be constructed. Under this treaty the United States frequently intervened to maintain freedom of transit in times of political disturbance. The Panama Railroad^o, built by American enterprise, was completed in 1855, and was for some years extensively used by travelers from the East coast to California.

In 1881 a French company, sponsored by Ferdinand de Lesseps, began the construction of a canal at Panama, under a concession granted by Colombia in 1878. After doing a substantial part of the necessary excavation this company failed, partly because of financial mismanagement and partly because of the terrific ravages of yellow fever among its employees. A new company took over the concession, but without the necessary capital to continue the work. Meanwhile an American company had also failed in an attempt to build a canal across Nicaragua^o.

After the voyage of the *Oregon*^o around South America at the beginning of the Spanish-American War had emphasized the need for a canal from the standpoint of national defense, the United States Government undertook the task of construction which had proved beyond the capacity of private enterprise. A commission established in 1899 studied both the Panama and Nicaragua routes, and recommended in favor of the former when it was learned that the French company would sell its rights for \$40,000,000. The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, which would have been an obstacle to exclusive American control, was replaced by the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty^o, signed Nov. 18, 1901. This provided that the United States should construct and control the canal, keeping it open, however, to ships of war and commerce of all nations on equal terms.

The Hay-Herran Treaty^o, by which Colombia would have authorized the building of the canal, was signed Jan. 22, 1903, but was not approved by the Colombian congress. The result was the Panama revolution^o and the signature of the treaty of Nov. 18, 1903, with the new Republic of Panama. By this the United States guaranteed the independence of Panama, and was granted in perpetuity the "use, occupation and control" of a zone ten miles wide for the "construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection" of the canal, with the right to add to this zone such other lands as might be needed for the purposes indicated. Panama was paid \$10,000,000, and in addition an annuity of \$250,000 be-

ginning nine years after the exchange of ratifications.

Construction began in 1904, and the Canal was opened to commerce in 1914. Its original cost was approximately \$400,000,000, but subsequent improvements and additions have greatly increased this amount. The man chiefly responsible for the work of construction was Col., later Maj. Gen., George W. Goethals.

The occupation of the Canal Zone, and the measures necessary for the construction and operation of the Canal, raised many delicate problems. Panama's two principal cities were entirely surrounded by Canal Zone territory until the cession of the *Savanas* lands in 1914 gave Panama City a corridor to the other territory of the Republic. Furthermore they formed continuous urban areas with the chief American settlements in the Zone, so that conditions within them directly affected the welfare of the Canal working force. The Canal Treaty had consequently authorized the United States to intervene if necessary to maintain public order in Panama and Colon. This right has been exercised only on a few occasions, but threats of disorder frequently have led the United States to use its good offices in internal political disputes in the early years of the Republic. The treaty also gave the United States important rights in connection with the sanitation of the two Panaman cities, and public health work there has, since 1905, been under the direction of the health officer of the Canal. The elimination of yellow fever⁹ and the control of other tropical diseases which made the Isthmus notoriously unhealthy were absolutely essential if the Canal was to be built. This was accomplished under the direction of Dr. William C. Gorgas, who was health officer for several years during the construction period.

The exact character of the rights enjoyed by the United States in the Canal Zone has been the subject of prolonged dispute. The United States has insisted upon a literal interpretation of Article III of the Treaty of 1903, which grants to it "all the rights, power, and authority within the Zone" which it would possess "if it were the sovereign of the territory," but Panama has maintained that these rights were granted only for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Canal, and has consequently objected to any acts of the United States in the Zone which were not strictly necessary for these purposes. The first controversy began in 1904, when the United States opened the Zone to commerce and established post offices there, but a compromise was reached in December, 1904, when Secretary of War Taft visited the Isthmus.

An executive order which he issued limited importations at Zone ports to supplies for the Canal and for persons connected with it or ships in passing through, and to goods in transit. Panama in return made certain concessions, chiefly with respect to customs duties. This "Taft Agreement" was intended to be in effect only during the construction period, but it was not formally abrogated until 1924, and the principles which it established have in fact governed the policy of the United States in the Zone down to the present day. The underlying legal question, however, was not settled, and frequent disputes occurred, many of them in connection with the operation of the American commissaries in the Zone.

An effort to replace the Taft Agreement with a permanent arrangement and to settle other outstanding questions was made when a new treaty was signed in 1926. This would have perpetuated the restrictions which the United States had already imposed upon itself in connection with commercial operations in the Canal Zone, and would further have provided for territorial adjustments and for co-operation in the defense of the Canal. Internal political complications in Panama prevented its ratification.

A treaty providing for still further concessions to Panama was signed March 2, 1936, and ratified in 1939. This contains a provision abrogating the guarantee of Panama's independence and the right of the United States to intervene in Panaman territory. It also increases the amount of the canal annuity to 430,000 Panaman *balboas*, equivalent to a like sum in United States currency, thus meeting Panama's demand that the annuity be paid in gold dollars rather than devaluated dollars, and grants other concessions to Panama.

A diplomatic dispute with Great Britain occurred when the United States Congress exempted American coastwise vessels from canal tolls under the Panama Canal Act of 1912 (*see* Panama Tolls Question). The British government protested that this was a clear violation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty. While the United States did not officially admit the justice of this contention, President Wilson procured the repeal of the exemption in 1914.

Aside from the facilitation of transportation between the East and West coasts of the United States, the most important result of building the Canal has probably been the improvement of communications between the Atlantic and Gulf ports of the United States and the west coast of Central and South America. American trade with the west coast countries has greatly increased, partly at least because of more direct

steamer connections. At the same time, the countries of that region have profited greatly from better shipping connections, not only with the United States but through the Canal to European ports.

[Diplomatic History of the Panama Canal, *Sen. Doc. No. 474*, 63rd Congress, 2nd Session; W. D. McCam, *The United States and the Republic of Panama*; F. J. Haskin, *The Panama Canal*.]

DANA G. MUNRO

Panama City, from the time of its foundation in 1519, has been important as the western terminus of the transit route across the Isthmus, the center from which the exploration and conquest of the Pacific coast of Central and South America was carried on, and a point of transshipment throughout the colonial period for goods going to Peru. The city was moved to its present location after the buccaneer Henry Morgan sacked and destroyed it in 1671. It became the capital of the Republic of Panama in 1903. Though not a part of the Canal Zone, it is almost completely surrounded by Zone territory, and is the Pacific terminus of the Panama Railroad⁹⁹.

[C. L. G. Anderson, *Old Panama and Castilla del Oro*.]

DANA G. MUNRO

Panama Congress, THE (1826). On Sept. 6, 1815 Simon Bolivar wrote his so-called "prophetic letter" while an exile in Jamaica, expressing a wish that some day a "congress of representatives of the republics, kingdoms, and empires of America" might meet on the Isthmus of Panama "to deal with the high interests of peace and war." Finally, on Dec. 7, 1824, Bolivar sent invitations for such a congress to Colombia, Mexico, Central America, Brazil, the United Provinces of Buenos Aires, and Peru. The United States was eventually invited at the insistence of Colombia and Mexico. The congress met at Panama City from June 22 to July 15, 1826. Ten meetings were held, but only Colombia, Peru, Mexico and Central America were represented. One United States delegate died before reaching the meeting and the other arrived after adjournment. The delegates signed a treaty of perpetual union and confederation and a convention providing for an army of 60,000 men to defend the interests of the union. Other matters were discussed, but none of the acts was ratified by all of the governments. The congress adjourned to meet in Mexico, but never convened.

[J. B. Lockey, *Pan-Americanism, Its Beginnings*.]

A. CURTIS WILGUS

Panama-Pacific International Exposition, THE, held in San Francisco from Feb. 4 to Dec. 4,

Panama Revolution

1915, celebrated the opening of the Panama Canal⁹⁹ and the earlier discovery of the Pacific Ocean. Approximately 19,000,000 visitors thronged its 635 acres so that the official balance sheet showed an ultimate profit of \$1,312,150. Despite the World War in progress during the exposition thirty-one foreign nations participated—twenty-five officially and six unofficially. Twenty-five American states, Hawaii, the Philippines and the City of New York erected their own exhibit buildings. Notable were the landscaping, lighting effects and the architectural unity achieved through the use of Spanish and Italian Renaissance and Spanish Baroque. This exposition was the first held in America that did not stress the industrial or scientific phases of modern life. Its greatest accomplishments were cultural; it was the most artistic of American fairs.

FRANK MONAGHAN

Panama Railroad Company, THE, was built by an American company (1850-55) at a cost of about \$8,000,000. Until the building of transcontinental railways in the United States, it carried many thousands of passengers on their way from New York to California, and its operation was exceedingly profitable. Later, the French canal company purchased nearly all of the capital stock. These French shares were subsequently transferred to the Government of the United States with other assets of the French company, and the remainder of the stock was also acquired. The line is now operated by a corporation owned by the United States Government.

[W. F. Johnson, *Four Centuries of the Panama Canal*.]

DANA G. MUNRO

Panama Revolution, THE. On Aug. 12, 1903, the Colombian congress refused to ratify the Hay-Herran Treaty⁹⁹ authorizing the construction of an interoceanic canal at Panama by the United States. The evident purpose was to obtain greater financial benefits, either from the United States or from the French canal company which had already agreed to sell its interests to the United States. This caused much discontent at Panama, and on Nov. 3 a group of revolutionists, aided by the commander of the local garrison, seized control of the city and proclaimed the Republic of Panama. The movement was financed by the French engineer, Bunau-Varilla, working in the interests of the French canal company.

Colombian forces had been sent to Colon, on the opposite side of the Isthmus, just before the outbreak, but they were prevented from crossing to Panama by the commander of the U.S.S. *Nashville*, which had likewise just arrived. This action

was based on the Bidlack-Mallarino Treaty⁷ of 1846 under which the United States considered itself authorized to intervene to maintain freedom of transit across the Isthmus. Its effect was to prevent the suppression of the revolt. On Nov. 6, furthermore, the United States recognized the independence of Panama. The revolutionists appointed Bunau-Varilla as Panaman minister at Washington, and on Nov. 18 he signed a treaty with Secretary of State Hay by which the United States was given the right to build a canal and in return guaranteed Panama's independence (see Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty). Thereafter the United States refused to permit Colombia to make any attempt to restore her authority on the Isthmus.

The Colombian government asserted that the revolt had been instigated and aided by the United States, and that the action of the American forces in preventing Colombian troops from crossing the Isthmus was improper. President Theodore Roosevelt and Secretary Hay denied that any responsible American official had been in communication with the revolutionists before the revolt. They defended the action of the American forces as justifiable under the Treaty of 1846. With regard to the unusually prompt recognition of Panama's independence, they argued that the building of the Canal was necessary to the United States and the world, that Colombia's refusal of permission had been unreasonable, and that the people of Panama had been justified in revolting against an action which had threatened to injure their vital interests. Nevertheless, the United States Government subsequently made reparation to Colombia⁸.

[Diplomatic History of the Panama Canal, *Senate Document No. 474*, 63rd Congress, 2nd Session; G. H. Stuart, *Latin America and the United States*.]

DANA G. MUNRO

Panama Tolls Question. A bill to regulate the Panama Canal⁹ which became a law late in 1912 exempted coastwise vessels of the United States from payment of tolls. In its original form it had exempted all American vessels, but under British protest it had been modified. The British government repeated its protest, pointing out that the exemption violated the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty¹⁰, which said that the Canal was "to be open to British and American vessels on equal terms." It asked for repeal of the exemption clause or arbitration of the dispute. The American Government, in reply, defended exemption, but expressed willingness to arbitrate. Many Americans opposed exemption as a violation of the treaty. President Wilson, March 5, 1914, asked Congress to repeal the exemption clause, which

was soon done; and on June 15, 1914, the President signed the repeal bill. Since the Canal was not then completed, no tolls had yet been charged.

[M. W. Williams, *Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815-1915*.]

MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS

Panay Incident. On Dec. 12, 1937, Japanese bombers, engaged in an attack upon China, sank the United States gunboat *Panay* and three Standard Oil supply ships twenty-seven miles above Nanking on the Yangtze. Three were killed and more wounded. Secretary of State Hull demanded full redress. Japan accepted responsibility, made formal apologies, promised indemnities and appropriate punishment and gave future assurances. Hull accepted these assurances and the incident was closed. Indemnities were later set at \$2,214,007.

[*Foreign Policy Reports*, Vol. XIII, No. 23.]

OSCAR OSBURN WINTHER

Panhandle. A long, usually narrow, tract of land appended to the main area of a state. There are several such areas in the United States. The Panhandle of West Virginia extends northward between Pennsylvania and Ohio. This is the rather accidental result of the definition of Pennsylvania's western boundary and the grant by Virginia of its western lands¹¹. The Panhandle of Oklahoma is a long strip about twenty-five miles wide, lying between Texas on the south and Colorado and Kansas on the north (see Cimarron, Proposed Territory of). The Panhandle of Texas is a large, nearly square area, including the northern portion of the state. The term is also applied to the northern portion of Idaho where it projects between Washington and Montana, and also occasionally to the projection at the southeast corner of Missouri, the western portion of Nebraska where it extends north of Colorado, the addition to Pennsylvania at its northwestern corner along the shore of Lake Erie, and to the long western extension of Florida.

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD

Pani is a slave of the Indian race. The origin of the term is unknown; efforts to identify it with the Pawnee tribe are more fanciful than convincing.

M. M. QUATFE

Panic of 1785, THE, put an end to the business boom following the Revolution and ushered in a period of hard times, which, severest in 1785-86, lasted until 1788. Its causes lay in the over-expansion, extravagance and debt making which followed Yorktown¹²; the deflation which accompanied the end of army contracts and

privateering^{qv}; the blow to American manufactures from large imports of British goods, and lack of adequate credit facilities and a sound circulating medium. The depression was accentuated by the absence of any central mechanism for promoting interstate trade and by state laws interfering with it; by the British refusal to conclude a commercial treaty; and by disorders among debtor groups (*see* Shays' Rebellion). The deep alarm of business and propertied groups gave strength to the demand for a stronger Federal Government (*see* Convention of 1787).

[John Bach McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*, Vol. I; D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*; Harry J. Carman, *Social and Economic History of the United States*, Vol. I.] ALLAN NEVINS

Panic of 1791. The economic prosperity which accompanied the launching of the Federal Government developed into a speculative boom by 1791. Schemes for internal improvements^{qv}, the chartering by state legislatures of inadequately financed banks, speculation in bank scrip, government securities and western lands brought a collapse. Much of the bank scrip proved to be of no value, and there were many failures for large amounts.

[James Schouler, *History of the United States of America*, Vol. I.] CHARLES MARION THOMAS

Panic of 1819. THE, resulted from a sharp contraction of credit initiated by the second Bank of the United States^{qv}. Overexpansion by the banks during the preceding years had encouraged speculation in commodities and land. A period of severe depression followed the contraction. Many banks suspended specie payments; the Bank of the United States went through a trying period of incrimination, congressional investigation and financial rehabilitation. Prices declined; cotton, for example, fell 50% within a year. Niles, a contemporary editor, was "sickened to the heart" at the large numbers of sheriff's sales and imprisonments for debt. Although the situation alarmed the administration, John Quincy Adams, who was then Secretary of State, believed that the Government could do nothing "but transfer discontents, and propitiate one class . . . by disgusting another." Nevertheless, manufacturers clamored for more protection, and debtors demanded relief legislation. The Order of Tammany called for "a fundamental change in morals and habits."

[W. B. Smith and A. H. Cole, *Fluctuations in American Business, 1790-1860*; S. Rezneck, *The Depression of 1819-1822*, *American Historical Review*, October, 1933.]

SAMUEL REZNECK

Panic of 1837. THE, was due to a number of factors. Between 1830-36 enormous state debts were piled up in the construction of canals and railroads and in the chartering of new banks^{qv}. At the same time the banks expanded their credit; land speculation prevailed in all sections of the country, and imports exceeded exports. In 1836 three events occurred which precipitated a crisis. To check the land speculation President Jackson on July 11, 1836, issued the Specie Circular^{qv} which required all payments for public lands to be made in specie. This cramped the operations of the banks which had been financing the western land speculation. On June 23, 1836, Congress passed an act to distribute the surplus revenue^{qv} in the Treasury among the states, thereby causing the depository banks to contract their credit. To make matters worse, there was a financial crisis in England and British creditors began to call in their loans, while the failure of the American crops lessened the purchasing power of the farmers. On May 10, 1837, the New York banks suspended specie payment^{qv}; and they were followed by most of the banks in the country. The depression lasted until 1843, and was most severely felt in the West and the South. There was a general suspension of public works; a demand for more stringent banking laws; great unemployment; state defalcations and repudiations. The Independent Treasury system was established and the universal distress contributed to the return of the Whigs^{qv} to power in 1840.

[R. C. McGrane, *The Panic of 1837*.]

REGINALD C. McGRANE

Panic of 1857. THE, was a typical "bust" following a typical American "boom." The decade following the Mexican War saw speculation run riot in railroad construction, growth of manufacturing, expansion of the wheat belt, land speculation, and expansion of poorly regulated state banking^{qv}. The opening of the California gold fields^{qv} contributed to the general spirit of speculation.

The failure of the Ohio Life Insurance Company of Cincinnati in August of 1857 pricked the bubble. The panic spread from the Ohio Valley into the urban centers of the East and with the approach of winter unemployment grew, breadlines formed and ominous signs of social unrest appeared.

The depression was more serious in the rising industrial areas of the East and wheat belt of the West than in the cotton South. Faced by British competition and balked by Southern low tariff policies, the industrial East turned to the Republican party^{qv}. The Middle West, hit by bank failures^{qv} and faced with Southern hostility

to free land, likewise turned into the new party. The Cotton Belt⁷⁶ was less affected by the panic. Cotton crops were good, prices were high and banks were sound. These factors brought overconfidence in the South, an impulse to protection in the East and a drive for free land in the West. The election of 1860⁷⁷, therefore, must be viewed against this economic background which was no less potent than the "moral" issue of slavery.

[L. C. Helderman, *National and State Banks—A Study of Their Origins.*]

L. C. HELDERMAN

Panic of 1873. THE, was precipitated by the failure of a number of important Eastern firms: the New York Warehouse and Securities Company on Sept. 8; Kenyon, Cox and Company on Sept. 13; and worst of all, Jay Cooke⁷⁸ and Company on Sept. 18. Days of pandemonium followed, President Grant hurrying to New York, the Stock Exchange closing for ten days and bankruptcy overtaking a host of companies and individuals. Some of the causes of the panic and ensuing depression were world wide: a series of wars, including the Austro-Prussian, Franco-Prussian, and American civil conflicts; excessive railroad construction in middle Europe, Russia, South America and the United States; commercial dislocations caused by the opening of the Suez Canal; and world-wide speculation, over-expansion and extravagance. Other causes were more peculiar to the United States: currency inflation and credit inflation; governmental waste; the losses from the Boston and Chicago fires; overinvestment in railroads, factories and buildings; and an adverse trade balance. Even in 1872 the United States had suffered more than 4000 failures for a total of some \$121,000,000. The depression following the panic proved one of the worst in American history. For the two years 1876-77 business failures numbered more than 18,000. A majority of American railroads went into bankruptcy; more than two thirds of the iron mills and furnaces lay idle; by the beginning of 1875 fully 500,000 men were out of work; and in the absence of organized public relief, destitution and hunger far outstripped the efforts of charity to keep up. Wage reductions caused strikes among the coal miners of Pennsylvania and textile operatives of New England in 1875-78, and a railroad walkout in 1877 (*see Railroad Strikes of 1877*) accompanied by appalling violence. Beggary, prostitution and crime increased, while political and economic radicalism gained ground. But in 1878 the clouds began to lift and the following year the depression gave way to good times.

[W. A. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic, 1865-1877*; Alexander Dana Noyes, *Forty Years of American Finance*, Allan Nevins, *The Emergence of Modern America, 1865-1878*, Harry J. Carman, *Social and Economic History of the United States*, Vol. II.]

ALLAN NEVINS

Panic of 1893. The background of this spectacular financial crisis is found in the usual factors of the business cycle⁷⁹, together with an inflexible banking system. Capital investments in the 1880's had exceeded the possibilities of immediately profitable use, and the trend of prices continued generally downward.

The uneasy state of British security markets in 1890, culminating in the Baring panic, stopped the flow of foreign capital into American enterprise, and the resale of European-held securities caused a market collapse in New York and substantial exports of gold. Panic seemed pending that autumn but instead turned to uneasy stagnation. The huge exports of agricultural staples the next two years re-established gold imports and postponed the crisis. A high degree of uncertainty returned in the winter of 1892-93, aided by the well-publicized danger that the country would be forced off the gold standard⁸⁰ by the decline in the Treasury's gold reserve, which bore the brunt of the renewed exports of gold and also suffered from decreased Federal revenues and heavy expenditures, including the purchases of silver under the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890⁸¹.

The Philadelphia and Reading Railroad failed in February and the gold reserve fell below the accepted minimum of \$100,000,000 in April. The National Cordage Company failed in May and touched off a stock-market panic. Banks in the South and West were especially hard pressed, and nearly 600 in the entire country suspended, at least temporarily. Commercial failures followed in great numbers. This condition continued throughout the summer and all currency was at a premium in New York in August.

Many of President Cleveland's advisers had been urging him to force repeal of the silver purchase act, since his election the previous November. The panic atmosphere furnished the opportunity, and repeal was advanced as the one absolute cure for the depression. By Oct. 30 it had passed both houses of Congress. In the meantime, imports of gold had stabilized the monetary situation in New York somewhat, but the depression continued. The winter of 1893-94, and the summer following, witnessed widespread unemployment, strikes met by violence, and a march upon Washington of "Coxey's Army"⁸²—all part of the human reaction to the tragedy. The depression

did not lift substantially until the poor European crops of 1897 stimulated American exports and the importation of gold. The rising prices which followed helped to restore prosperous conditions.

[O. M. W. Sprague, *History of Crises under the National Banking System*; Otto C. Lightner, *History of Business Depressions*.]

ELMER ELLIS

Panic of 1907. Business prosperity characterized the opening months of the year 1907 and continued until autumn, although prices of corporate securities and commodities declined sharply in the spring. The failures of the Knickerbocker Trust Company of New York City on Oct. 22, and the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company on Oct. 23 were followed by a stock-exchange panic, bank suspensions and failures dotted the country. The United States Treasury Department and J. P. Morgan & Co. each loaned \$25,000,000 to the New York banks to alleviate the situation, and the acute stage of the panic passed in December.

[Willard L. Thorp, *Business Annals*.]

FRANK PARKER

Panic of 1920. See Depression of 1920.

Panic of 1929. THE, was a stock-market panic exclusively. The trend of stock prices had been upward since 1924. In 1927 the Federal Reserve[™] authorities inaugurated an easy money policy, partly to assist business which was experiencing a slight recession and partly to assist foreign nations which had been losing gold to the United States. Unfortunately, the low money rates resulting from this policy fanned the flames of speculation in the stock market and prices of stocks began to rise with alarming rapidity.

Early in 1928 the Federal Reserve Board began to feel somewhat uneasy over the stock-market situation. In January and February discount rates at the Federal Reserve banks were raised from 3½% to 4%. From April through June a further advance to 4½% occurred at all the Reserve banks, and by the end of the year rates had been raised to 5% at all but the four western Reserve banks. Reserve bank holdings of government securities were also sharply reduced during the year and open market rates hardened decidedly, the call loan rate reaching 8.6% by December.

In spite of the rate increases noted, speculation in stocks continued unabated. Accordingly, in February, 1929, the Federal Reserve Board changed its policy to one of direct pressure on member banks not to increase their loans to

brokers. This policy was continued until Aug. 9, when the Federal Reserve Bank of New York was allowed to raise its discount rate to 6%. The policy of direct pressure, although effective as far as member-bank loans to brokers were concerned, was not effective in breaking the speculative mania, because of a huge increase in non-banking loans to brokers, placed through the agency of the New York banks.

Although there was a recession in stock prices in March and declines in certain stocks at various times throughout the spring and summer, the final crash did not come until Oct. 24, 1929. On that day the market broke badly and prices hurtled downward with unprecedented rapidity. The bankers formed a pool to support the market with temporary success, but the bull market was definitely broken and the trend of stock prices moved inexorably downward until they reached appalling lows in the summer of 1932.

Despite the enormous crash in stock prices, no money panic ensued. The New York banks, in conjunction with the Federal Reserve Bank, met all legitimate demands for credit and the liquidation was carried out on as orderly a basis as the terrific collapse in stock prices would permit. No losses on call loans to brokers were reported.

[*Annual Reports of the Federal Reserve Board*, 1927-28-29; F. L. Allen, *Only Yesterday*; C. O. Hardy, *Credit Policies of the Federal Reserve System*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Panic of 1937. See Recession of 1937.

Panics and Depressions. See Business Cycles.

Panmure, Fort, was the old French Fort Rosalie[™] at Natchez, as renamed after British occupancy in 1764. Bernardo Galvez captured it for Spain in 1779, and the Spanish retained it until 1798, when it was surrendered to the United States in accordance with the Pinckney Treaty[™] of 1795. It was demolished in 1805.

[Dunbar Rowland, ed., *Mississippi*, Cyclopedic, Vol. I; Joseph Dunbar Shields, *Natchez: Its Early History*; Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi, The Heart of the South*, Vol. I.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Panoche Grande Claim, THE, of William McGarrahan, a celebrated land fraud comparable in its odor to the Crédit Mobilier[™], and more commonly known as the New Idria Quicksilver Mine, is located in San Benito County, Calif. With a total output of 38,000,000 pounds to January, 1938, the mine is the sixth largest in the world. McGarrahan's claim, based on a questionable Mexican land grant of Vicente Gómez

and Pacificus Ord, was purchased by him after "squatters" had discovered quicksilver. Not confirmed after the American conquest of Californiasm and denied by the United States Supreme Court a number of times, the claim was taken by McGarrahan to practically every Congress from 1859 onward, but to no avail. In the struggle for the mine, McCarrahan was charged with constant lobbying and malpractice.

[B. Harte, *The Story of a Mine*, R. J. Parker, William McGarrahan's Panoche Grande Claim, in *Pacific Historical Review*, V, No. 3.]

ROBERT J. PARKER

Panorama, Diorama and Cyclorama. Few of the large-scale pictures of American landscapes and historical scenes have survived the passage of time. Among the early panoramas were continuous scenes unrolled for view before an audience, as for example the moving scenic backdrop for Dunlap's *Trip to Niagara* performed at New York in 1828. Dioramas, or scenes viewed through an aperture for short-range observation, were first shown in London in 1823, and later in America. The term came to include both large and small scale views. But these types recorded comparatively little of historic significance. During the post-Civil War period the highly popular cycloramas, or huge panoramic scenes painted on the inner side of cylindrical surfaces, around a platform for spectators stationed in the center, recorded important historic scenes with great fidelity. They were exhibited at Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Chicago. Their subject matter included Custer's Last Fight, the battles of Vicksburg, of Gettysburg, of Chattanooga, of Atlanta and of Missionary Ridge.

[G. C. D. Odell, *Annals of the New York Stage*, Vol. III; Boston Cyclorama Company, *Cyclorama of Gen. Custer's Last Fight against the Sioux Indians*; Columbia Panorama Company, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Battles of Vicksburg*; P. Philippoteaux, *Cyclorama of the Battle of Gettysburg*, A. Lohn and F. W. Heine, *Panorama of the Battles of Chattanooga*; T. R. Davis, How a Great Battle Panorama is Made, in *Saint Nicholas*, December, 1886.]

T. BOLTON

Panton, Leslie & Co. was organized in East Florida during the Revolution, by William Panton and other loyalistssm from Georgia. Spain permitted this company to remain after the war and in 1785 gave it the whole Creek trade, adding that of the Choctaws and Chickasawssm in 1788. Well organized both in England and America, exempted from duties and intimately associated with Alexander McGillivray, it drove most competitors from the Creek, Cherokee, Choctaw and Chickasaw nations, and was the principal instrument with which Spain won and held the Indians. Supplies bought from the company, and

munitions furnished by Spain (largely obtained from the company and delivered through it), were the principal resources of the southern Indians in their struggles with the Americans. Before the Treaty of San Lorenzosm the company helped promote trouble between the Indians and Americans to keep out rivals. After 1795 it confined itself to business and was able to keep most of the trade, even after Spain withdrew to the 31st parallel, although the United States Government tried to compete with it. The company and its successor, Forbes & Co. (Panton died in 1801), continued to handle most of the Indian trade until about 1817. (See also Spanish-Indian Relations, 1783-1803.)

[A. P. Whitaker, *The Spanish-American Frontier, 1783-1795*, and *The Mississippi Question, 1795-1803*.]

DUVON CLOUGH CORBITT

Paoli, The Battle of, was fought Sept. 20, 1777, when the British, under Gen. Grey, in an early morning attack, surprised Gen. Wayne's division of 1500 men encamped near Paoli Inn, Pa. Under orders from Washington to harass the British to delay Howe's advance upon Philadelphia, Wayne maneuvered to join Gen. Smallwood for a concerted attack. Tory spies had revealed Wayne's position to Gen. Grey and, advancing in overwhelming numbers, under cover of darkness, the British bayoneted ruthlessly, killing 300 and wounding 70.

[Gilbert Cope and J. Smith Futhey, *History of Chester County*.]

JULIAN P. BOYD

Papal States, Diplomatic Service to. During the period 1797-1867 eleven American consuls resident in Rome were accredited to the papal government. There were also consulates in Civita Vecchia and Ancona. Formal diplomatic relations were inaugurated in 1848 with the appointment of Jacob L. Martin as chargé d'affaires for the United States a post which later carried with it the title of minister. The last American minister to the papal states was Rufus King, the legation being suppressed in 1867 through failure of Congress to continue the appropriation for its support. This action was protested by King as being based on misunderstanding of a papal regulation regarding Protestant services in Rome. While the legation lasted relations between the two governments were friendly. During the Civil War the papal authorities withheld recognition from the Confederacy on the ground that the North represented legitimate government in the United States and, after the conflict, delivered over to Washington the American, John H. Surratt, who had enlisted in the papal army while

under indictment for complicity in Lincoln's assassination⁹⁰.

[L. F. Stock, *United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, 1848-1868.*]

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Paper and Pulp. In 1690 William Bradford, a Philadelphia printer, combined with William Rittinghuysen, a Dutch paper maker (whose name was Americanized to Rittenhouse), and two other men, to erect the first small paper mill in America, on Wissahickon Creek near Philadelphia. Rittenhouse presently bought out the others and his descendants carried on, the third mill, built by William Rittenhouse, III, standing until near the end of the 19th century. In 1700 three men could make by hand $4\frac{1}{2}$ reams of rag newspaper in 20- by 30-inch sheets in a day, though several days were actually required to dry and finish the sheet. A mill built on Chester Creek, not far off, in 1729, had as its first product fuller's pressboard. Progress in paper making was slow until 1756, when the first pulp engine was introduced from Holland; then the number of mills increased more rapidly. In 1794 a mill for making coarse wrapping paper from the bark of the basswood tree was established at Fairhaven, Vt., by Congressman Matthew Lyon, this being the first attempt in America to use anything but rags for pulp. Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin found in 1810 that some paper was still being imported, but that the greater part used in the United States was of our own manufacture; "and if sufficient attention were given to the preservation of rags, the United States could produce all its own paper." That was always the manufacturers' problem; they could never get enough rags; and after 1800 small quantities of mechanically ground wood pulp began to be mixed with the rag. The census of 1810 showed 202 paper mills in the country, of which 64 were in Pennsylvania, 28 in New York, and 23 in Massachusetts. Not only were book, writing and wrapping papers being made, but pasteboard, wallpaper and playing cards. But not until 1820 did the United States Senate buy American paper for its stationery.

The first steam paper mill—steam for the pulp engine, that is; the sheet was still made by hand—began operation at Pittsburgh in 1816. The first cylinder machine for making paper was devised by Thomas Gilpin in 1817 and used by him in his mill on Brandywine Creek. The Fourdrinier machine, which made paper on an endless cloth web, was introduced from Europe in 1820. Thereafter, machinery slowly displaced handwork. By 1880 only three handmade paper plants were left; but the last of these, in Adams, Mass., con-

tinued hand manufacture until 1906. By 1829 paper was being made from straw and dried grass in Philadelphia, and shortly afterward old paper itself was repulped and made into new. In 1831 the value of chlorine in cleaning pulp was discovered, and made possible the use of materials hitherto unavailable; and in their desperation over the lack of rags, manufacturers were testing every fibrous substance they could find. In 1853 wood began to be chemically disintegrated for pulp, and more and more wood began to be mixed into book and news paper. The manufacture of straw paper for printing purposes began in Columbia County, N. Y., in 1830, though about one fifth of the pulp was composed of rope and bagging. The introduction of the Mellier process from France in 1857 caused a rapid increase in the manufacture of straw paper, and most books and newspapers were printed upon it thereafter until after 1870, when wood pulp rapidly superseded it for newspapers, giving to them a fragility and quick disintegration which is the despair of librarians and historians. Spruce being the wood preferred for pulp, new paper-making regions appeared near the northern forest areas, as for example, around Lake Winnebago and Fox River in Wisconsin, where the first mill was built at Appleton in 1853. Maine has in the 20th century become one of the great paper-making states, though Massachusetts still retains pre-eminence in some respects, especially as to fine writing and printing papers. Cheaper wood pulp than our own has been sought, and in 1932, of the more than 5,000,000 cords of spruce being used in our mills, about one half was imported, most of it from Canada, some from Scandinavia. Beginning with the strawboard mills in 1889, the various kinds of paper mills were organized in large groups or "trusts." The enormous increase in the number of articles made from paper—packing boxes, drinking cups, milk containers and hundreds of other new items being added—brought the annual output of our paper industries by 1935 to a value of more than \$1,000,000,000.

[Lyman Horace Weeks, *A History of Paper Making in the United States, 1690-1916.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Paper Money in the United States has consisted of three types, bills of credit or government notes, paper certificates representing deposited coin or bullion, and bank notes⁹¹. Beginning with Massachusetts in 1690, the various colonies issued bills, usually in excessive amounts, until stopped by English legislation in 1751 and 1764. The issue of paper bills was revived during the Revolutionary War, the Conti-

mental Congress⁷⁷ authorizing forty issues totaling over \$241,000,000 in 1775-79, while the states put out an additional \$210,000,000 in the same period.

Following the Revolution, the new government refrained from issuing paper money, with the exception of a \$3,000,000 issue of Treasury notes in 1815, until the Civil War when large amounts of greenbacks⁷⁸ were issued, as well as substantial amounts of fractional paper currency⁷⁹. The Confederacy also issued huge volumes of paper notes during the Civil War with disastrous results (see *Inflation in the Confederacy*).

The next issue of Treasury notes occurred in 1890 when such notes were authorized to purchase silver under the terms of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act⁸⁰ of that year. Between then and 1893, when the purchase clause was repealed, nearly \$156,000,000 of these notes were issued. They have since been retired.

Gold certificates were first authorized in 1863 and silver certificates⁸¹ in 1878. The Gold Reserve Act of 1934⁸² provided for a new type of gold certificate, which is not allowed to circulate, but silver certificates are still in circulation and provide the bulk of small-denomination paper currency.

Bank notes⁸³ have been permitted since the beginnings of the country and have constituted a large, but variable, proportion of total paper money. Prior to the Civil War, state bank notes and notes of the Banks of the United States⁸⁴ amounted to half or more of the circulating medium. Between 1866 and 1935, national bank notes⁸⁵ were an important element in the currency which is now in process of retirement. Since 1914 Federal Reserve notes and, on one occasion, Federal Reserve bank notes have occupied a significant place. At present roughly two thirds of our money in circulation is in the form of Federal Reserve notes⁸⁶.

[D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*; F. A. Bradford, *Money and Banking*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Parades have constituted a colorful and picturesque feature of American life since the early maneuvers of the colonial militia at muster or training day⁸⁷. They played their part in the battle of revolutionary propaganda on the eve of the Revolution (on June 25, 1775, wavering New York paraded in the morning to celebrate the arrival of Gen. Washington, and in the evening marched again to welcome Gov. Tryon), and in the early years of the republic they were one of the most popular political manifestations. It was perhaps during the past century—in an age of

militant patriotism, intense interest in politics, and easy susceptibility to the intoxicating effect of band music—that parades played their most conspicuous role.

Holiday celebrations were featured by tremendous parades for which the militia companies, volunteer firemen, patriotic clubs and political organizations turned out en masse, while every political campaign throve on the period's colorful torchlight processions. In 1880 a Republican torchlight parade in New York drew out some 60,000 marchers, headed by the city's leading merchants, and over 250,000 spectators lined the streets to cheer its progress.

Parades have retained their popularity even though they may not be held so frequently, and the growth of cities has had the natural effect of making them bigger and attracting even larger crowds to watch them. Those associated with our entry into the World War and the return of the A. E. F. represent the peak of such activity in the 20th century, but every city has occasions—Memorial Day, the annual police or firemen's parade, a convention of the American Legion—on which tremendous crowds turn out to hear the band and watch the marchers. A modern development has been the welcome accorded distinguished citizens—such as the countrywide receptions for Charles A. Lindbergh⁸⁸ after his successful flight to Paris—at which the parade is the triumphal progress of the day's hero, by automobile and almost unaccompanied, through the massed crowds of cheering onlookers.

FOSTER RHEA DULLES

Paraguay Expedition. On Feb. 1, 1855, the U.S.S. *Water Witch*, temporarily commanded by W. N. Jeffers, was fired on and the helmsman killed while surveying a channel of the Parana which was claimed to be Paraguayan territory. Unable to secure redress, the United States, in December, 1858, assembled a squadron of nineteen ships and 1708 men in the LaPlata under W. B. Shubrick. Two ships, the *Fulton* and the *Water Witch*, proceeded to Asuncion, supported by the remainder lower down the river. Shubrick and the American commissioner, James B. Bowlin, easily secured an apology and \$10,000 for the family of the helmsman, and concluded a treaty which granted free navigation.

[T. J. Page, *The LaPlata, the Argentine Confederation, and Paraguay; Report of the Secretary of the Navy, 1859.*]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Paramus (New Jersey) was the residence, during the Revolution, of Theodosia (Bartow) Prevost. Although the wife of a British officer on

duty in the West Indies, Mrs. Prevost, a woman of rare charm and culture, was trusted and permitted to remain with her family within the American lines. Her home, the Hermitage (now in Hohokus), an English Gothic mansion of much beauty and grace, with its extensive gardens, fountains, statuary and slave quarters, was a favorite resort of the most elegant society of the day. Here Washington rested after the battle of Monmouth; here Arnold's wife tarried for a night following the betrayal; and here Aaron Burr courted the widow Prevost.

[S. H. Wandell and Meade Minnigerode, *Aaron Burr*, Vol. I.]
G. A. TITUS

Parcel Post. Congress passed the parcel-post law chiefly because of its benefits to rural sections. The service of express companies stopped at railroad points, nor did it reach into unprofitable areas; whereas parcel post would bring express to the farmer's door. However, the service, which was inaugurated Jan. 1, 1913, proved popular with all classes. Rates were soon reduced and the weight limit, which at first was eleven pounds, was raised to fifty pounds in 1915. Since then, both weight and size limits have been further liberalized. The Government has no constitutional monopoly of the transportation of packages as it has of written communications, and, consequently, competes directly with the express companies for its business.

OLIVER W. HOLMES

Pardon, The Presidential Power of, covering postponements of execution, reductions of punishment and removals of legal punishment, applies to offenses against national laws and criminal contempt cases, but not to impeachment cases or state offenses. Valid full pardons must be accepted. Since 1927 commutations are valid without acceptance.

[*Ex parte Grossman*, 267 U. S. 87, 1925; *Biddle v. Perovich*, 274 U. S. 480, 1927.]

GEORGE C. ROBINSON

Pardon and Amnesty. Early in the Civil War, Congress provided severe penalties for those convicted of supporting the Confederacy. Imprisonment, the confiscation of property, and even death might be imposed. Furthermore, disqualification to hold any office in the United States was to follow conviction. The severest punitive measure, however, had a clement clause that authorized the President, at will, to extend by proclamation "pardon and amnesty" to participants in the rebellion. Lincoln saw fit to proclaim a conditional amnesty⁹⁹ on Dec. 8, 1863, and many thousands took advantage of it. After the war another

amnesty became necessary, which Johnson proclaimed on May 29, 1865, increasing his predecessor's exceptions, but providing that those excepted might make special application to him for pardon, which he would grant if desirable. This measure left a large number liable to punishment, including the leaders of the Confederacy and many people of means. The desire to participate in Reconstruction⁹⁹, to escape punishment, and to pursue some occupation caused thousands to apply for special pardon; and so freely were petitions granted that bitter opposition to the President's increasing clemency developed. Even threats to impeach him on that account were made in 1865. Thus it became evident, notwithstanding Johnson's declarations that "treason" was to be made "odious," that no one was likely to be punished for aiding the rebellion. On the contrary, those pardoned were running the reconstructed states and even being elected to Congress, where, if admitted, they would probably prevent desired legislation. What was to be done about it? Could the freedmen⁹⁹ be protected and the political influence of the amnestied whites be curtailed? In June, 1866, the Radical Republicans answered with the Fourteenth Amendment⁹⁹, the third section of which would keep many objectionable Southerners out of office. Johnson's opposition, however, encouraged ten Southern states to reject it.

Flush with victory in the election of 1866, the Radicals determined to curtail the President's power to grant amnesty. Johnson had not ceased granting special pardons, and there was danger of his proclaiming another amnesty, which, if universal, would pardon all remaining disabled. The result was the repeal of the clement clause in the punitive law mentioned above. The Radicals, declaring pardon and amnesty to have different meanings and applications, believed their act left the President only the power to grant individual pardons. Johnson and his friends, however, declared the words synonymous and cited precedents of presidential amnesties without congressional sanction; and they were to be supported by the courts. Even in December, 1866, the Supreme Court had declared that the pardoning "power of the president is not subject to legislative control" (*Ex parte Garland*⁹⁹), a decision confirmed in 1871 (*U. S. v. Klein*); and in 1870 the highest court in Nevada stated that "the constitutional power of the president . . . to pardon included the right to proclaim an amnesty" (*Davies v. McKeeby*). Moreover, seven years later the Supreme Court declared that no "distinction" between the words "is recognized in our law," the difference being "one rather of philo-

logical interest than of legal importance" (Knote v. U. S.).

It should also be noted that congressional reconstruction practically nullified the political benefits of presidential pardons and amnesties (see Reconstruction Acts). Nevertheless, Johnson, acting on his asserted constitutional right, proclaimed a second amnesty with fewer exceptions on Sept. 7, 1867. His enemies declared immediately "that the President shall now be certainly impeached." But impeachment (see Impeachment Trial of Andrew Johnson) did not restrain him, and on July 4, 1868, he granted another general amnesty. Now only a few remained disabled, and they were soon pardoned, for on Christmas Day, 1868, the President proclaimed a universal amnesty. This ended presidential clemency as far as the Civil War was concerned. The third section of the Fourteenth Amendment, however, replaced (July, 1868) on many who had supported the Confederacy a political disability that could only be removed by a two-thirds vote of both houses of Congress; and it was not until thirty years later that congressional amnesty was concluded.

[Jonathan T. Dorris, *Pardon and Amnesty during the Civil War and Reconstruction*; James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress*; Carl Schurz, *Reminiscences*; E. P. Oberholtzer, *A History of the United States since the Civil War*; *Diary of Gideon Welles*.] JONATHAN T. DORRIS

Pardon Seekers and Brokers. The disfranchised and proscribed Southerners excepted from President Johnson's amnesty⁷⁷ of May 29, 1865, soon began seeking individual pardons (see Pardon and Amnesty). Often their petitions were only brief requests for clemency; sometimes they contained long and able defenses of the Lost Cause⁷⁸ with suggestions of reconstruction. A few states appointed agents to look after their applicants' interests at Washington, and other "attorneys" likewise obtained pardons for their clients. Many petitioners went to the capital to hasten action on their cases—postmasters, cotton agents, tax receivers, prize commissioners, enrolling officers, congressmen, generals, judges, graduates of West Point and Annapolis, and persons worth at least \$20,000, all on the same mission. Some irregularities in obtaining pardons occurred, and much opposition to Johnson's increasing leniency developed. About 13,500 special pardons were granted and apparently the Adams Express Company handled more than \$1,300,000 in delivering pardon certificates.

[J. T. Dorris, *Pardon Seekers and Brokers: A Sequel of Appomattox*, in *The Journal of Southern History*, Vol. I, No. 3; Pardoning the Leaders of the Confederacy, in *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol.

XV, No. I; and *Pardon and Amnesty during the Civil War and Reconstruction*.]

JONATHAN T. DORRIS

Parent-Teacher Associations have a threefold purpose: to know the child through child study and parent education; to co-operate with the schools and other educational agencies in his training through shared participation with teachers and educators, and to control and build his environment through the development of public opinion and civic activity.

The National Congress of Parents and Teachers represented locally by parent-teacher associations was established in Washington, Feb. 17, 1897, as the National Congress of Mothers. The conception of a trained motherhood as envisioned by the founders, Mrs. Theodore Birney and Mrs. Phoebe Hearst, is directly traceable to their interest in the kindergarten, and the first work centered largely on the organization of mothers' groups. The need for the interest of teachers and fathers as well as mothers was recognized almost at once, and mothers' circles gradually became parent-teacher groups. In 1924 the name of the national organization was changed to the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

There are now in the national organization approximately 27,000 local parent-teacher associations in forty-nine state branches, including the District of Columbia and Hawaii, with a total enrolled membership of more than 2,000,000. There are many other parent-teacher associations with similar purposes that are not a part of the membership of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

[E. S. Holbeck, *An Analysis of the Activities and Potentialities for Achievement of the Parent-Teacher Association with Recommendations*, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York; *Publications of National Congress of Parents and Teachers*, Washington, D. C.] E. SCOTT HOLBECK

Paris, Declaration of (1856). At the end of the Crimean War of 1854-56, the representatives of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, Russia and Turkey adopted a declaration concerning maritime law, as follows: "(1) Privateering is, and remains, abolished; (2) The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war; (3) Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under enemy's flag; (4) Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective; that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy."

Other powers were invited to adhere to the Declaration in its entirety. Secretary of State Marcy, speaking for the United States Govern-

ment, declined to accede. The United States was still a small naval power and unwilling to abandon privateering unless the large naval powers would deny the right of belligerent public warships to capture private property, contraband excepted. Later in the Civil War the United States endeavored to accede, in order to outlaw Confederate privateering⁹⁷, but the powers declined. The United States never pursued privateering after the War of 1812, and has followed the principles of the Declaration of Paris since the American Revolution.

[Carlton Savage, *Policy of the United States toward Maritime Commerce in War*, Vol. I.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Paris, Pact of (1928). See Briand-Kellogg Pact.

Paris, Peace of (1783). In the war which is known to Americans as the Revolutionary War, Great Britain became successively engaged with the United States, France, Spain and the Netherlands. When the conflict came to an end treaties of peace between those four powers respectively and Great Britain were made. Preliminary articles between the United States and Great Britain had been signed at Paris on Nov. 30, 1782. Preliminaries of peace between Great Britain and the Netherlands were signed at Paris on Sept. 2, 1783. On Sept. 3, 1783, definitive treaties of peace between Great Britain and the United States, Great Britain and France, and Great Britain and Spain were signed; the definitive treaty of peace between the United States and Great Britain was signed at Paris because the British plenipotentiary, David Hartley, declined to go to Versailles for that purpose, although that course was desired by the American commissioners, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin and John Jay. The signing of the treaty with the United States took place in the morning; and after word thereof was received at Versailles the treaties with France and Spain were there signed between noon and one o'clock.

It is accordingly erroneous to speak of the Definitive Treaty of Peace⁹⁸ of Sept. 3, 1783, between the United States and Great Britain, as the Treaty of Versailles, since it was signed in Paris at the lodgings of David Hartley at the Hotel d'York. The location of the building has until recently been unknown to historians; researches of the last few years have shown that it was situated at number 5 (now 56) Rue Jacob; the structure, which was owned in 1937 by a publishing firm, still stands, though increased in height by two stories from its state in 1783, and otherwise altered.

[Francis Wharton, *Diplomatic Correspondence of the*

American Revolution, Vol. 6; John Jay Ide, in *Franco-American Review*, Summer, 1937.]

HUNTER MILLER

Paris, The Treaty of (1763), between Great Britain, France and Spain brought to an end the French and Indian War⁹⁹. In 1755 Great Britain had been willing to limit her jurisdiction in the interior of the continent by a line running due south from Cuyahoga Bay on Lake Erie to the 40th parallel and thence southwest to the 37th parallel, with the proviso that the territory beyond that line to the Maumee and Wabash rivers be a neutral zone. She claimed, however, an Acadia that would have included all the land between the Penobscot and St. Lawrence rivers and the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy, as well as the peninsula of Nova Scotia. The result of the British victory was an extension of British demands upon France to include the cession of all of Canada to Great Britain and the advancement of the boundary of the continental colonies westward to the Mississippi River. Both these demands, together with the right to navigate the Mississippi¹⁰⁰, were granted to Great Britain in the treaty. Similarly, Britain's claim to the "greater Acadia" was recognized, and Spain ceded Florida to Britain to offset the return of Cuba, which the British had conquered. As compensation for its losses, Spain received from France by the Treaty of Fontainebleau¹⁰¹ all of Louisiana west of the Mississippi River, and the island and city of New Orleans. France retained only the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, together with the privilege of fishing and drying fish along the northern and western coasts of Newfoundland as provided in the Treaty of Utrecht¹⁰². In the West Indies, Great Britain retained the islands of St. Vincent, Tobago and Dominica; St. Lucia was given to France. The Treaty of Paris left only two great colonial empires in the Western Hemisphere, the British and the Spanish.

[Theodore C. Pease, *Anglo-French Boundary Disputes in the West, 1749-1763*; Kate Hotblack, *The Peace of Paris, 1763*, in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, third series, II; Max Savelle, *The Diplomatic History of the Canadian Boundary, 1749-1763*.]

MAX SAVELLE

Paris, The Treaty of (1898), terminated the Spanish-American War¹⁰³. Under its terms Spain relinquished all authority over Cuba and ceded to the United States Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands and Guam¹⁰⁴, receiving from the United States \$20,000,000 as the estimated value of public works and improvements of nonmilitary character in the Philippines. Hostilities had been

suspended Aug. 12, and on Oct. 1 the five United States commissioners, headed by former Secretary of State William R. Day, opened negotiations with the Spanish commissioners in Paris. The most difficult questions encountered were the disposition of the Philippines, which Spain was reluctant to relinquish, and of the Spanish debt charged against Cuba, which the Spanish wished assumed by either Cuba or the United States. Eventually, Spain yielded on both points. An attempt by the United States commissioners to secure the island of Kusaie in the Carolines was blocked by Germany, which had opened negotiations for the purchase of these islands. The treaty was signed Dec. 10. The Senate, after a memorable debate over the adoption of a policy of "imperialism,"⁷⁰ exemplified in the annexation of the Philippines, consented to ratification by a close vote on Feb. 6, 1899. The treaty was proclaimed April 11, 1899.

[E. J. Benton, *International Law and Diplomacy of the Spanish-American War*, Julius W. Pratt, *Expansionists of 1898*.]

JULIUS W. PRATT

Paris Agreement, THE (1925), was an arrangement among Germany's reparations creditors (except the United States) to distribute the annuities scaled down from the original reparations bill by the Dawes Plan⁷¹. The share of the United States in this distribution was confirmed by the American-German debt agreement of June 23, 1930.

[Harold G. Moulton and Leo Pasvolksy, *War Debts and World Prosperity*; Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Diplomatic History of the United States*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Parish, THE, is the unit for ecclesiastical administration, particularly of the Roman Catholic Church, throughout the United States; and in the State of Louisiana⁷² it is also the civil or political unit for local administrative purposes, corresponding to the county in other states. The French and Spanish population of Louisiana disliked the county system established after the Louisiana Purchase⁷³, and the parish soon replaced the county as the local civil or political unit in the state.

[Alcée Fortier, ed., *Louisiana*, Cyclopedic, Vol. II; Henry E. Chambers, *History of Louisiana*, Vol. I.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Parity in naval defense was a principle used as a basis for the limitation of naval armaments adopted at the Washington Conference of 1921-22⁷⁴. As proposed by the American delegation, our then superiority in capital-ship tonnage was reduced to equality with the British and to five thirds of Japan's tonnage. Aircraft carrier allow-

ances in the same proportion were agreed upon, but other types of ships remained unlimited until the London Treaty of 1930⁷⁵ with America's corresponding ratio somewhat reduced. Restrictions upon naval base facilities in the Orient resulted in Japan having virtual parity with Britain or America for operations in those waters. With the notable naval concessions made by other powers in 1922 Japan consented to withdraw from current military occupation of northern China and to sign the Nine-Power Treaty⁷⁶ guaranteeing future political and territorial integrity of China. Japan refused to renew the naval limitation treaties upon their expiration in 1936, except on a basis of parity in ships, which Britain and America declined since this would give her great superiority in Far Eastern operations. Meantime, by failure to build to her treaty allowances, the United States had dropped well below her parity ratio.

[Dudley W. Knox, *A History of the U. S. Navy*.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Parker's Fort (Texas) was established at the headwaters of the Navasota River in Lime Stone County, Tex., in 1835. Around it grew up the first settlement in that region. In May, 1836, the settlement was attacked by 300 Comanche⁷⁷ and Caddo Indians. All the Texans were killed except Cynthia Ann Parker, a child, who was carried into captivity, grew up with the Indians, married, and had a son, Quanah Parker, who became chief of his tribe and a pacific influence in mediating between Indians and whites.

[F. W. Johnson and E. C. Barker, *History of Texas*.]

CARL L. GANNON

Parks, National. The national park idea was born when a group of Montana citizens seated around a wilderness campfire in 1870 visualized reservation of an area on the upper Yellowstone River for perpetual public use. In 1872 Congress, acting on the recommendations of leaders in this party, established the Yellowstone National Park⁷⁸ "as a pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." The ideals of these first national park enthusiasts have persisted, today national park development is recognized as a major land use. The national parks of the United States, twenty-six in number and more authorized, run the gamut in scientific interest, scenic beauty and historic importance. Yellowstone, in Wyoming, Montana and Idaho, is characterized by its geysers, varicolored canyon, and its herds of buffalo, elk and other animals that once abounded throughout the West. Yosemite, in California, is renowned for its spectacular valley, plunging waterfalls, and beauti-

ful granite high country. Sequoia and General Grant, also in California, are distinguished by many groves of California Big Trees—oldest of living things—and by mountain grandeur of the High Sierra. Mount Whitney in Sequoia National Park is the highest peak (14,495 feet) in the United States. Mount Rainier National Park, in Washington, presents a glacier system exceeding in size and beauty any other in the United States. The mountain itself, an extinct volcano helmeted in snow, is visible at a distance of more than 150 miles. Crater Lake, in Oregon, offers a lake of unbelievable blue, held within the abrupt walls of a tremendous crater in a mountaintop. Mesa Verde, in Colorado, is America's treasure house of prehistoric cliff dwellings^o. Glacier National Park, in Montana, boasts sixty small glaciers and hundreds of alpine lakes in rugged mountaintops. Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, is distinguished by spectacular peaks in the heart of the Rockies. The Trail Ridge Road climbs to the crest of the range and follows the ridge, offering spectacular views of mountain peaks and lovely valleys. Lassen Volcanic National Park, in California, holds the only active volcano in the United States. Hawaii National Park boasts the world's largest active volcano, Mauna Loa, and Kilauea's lake of fire. Mount McKinley National Park, in Alaska, features the highest mountain in North America, more than 20,000 feet high. Its wild animal paradise protects great herds of caribou, white mountain sheep, Alaska moose and the tundra brown bear. Grand Canyon, in Arizona, offers an unparalleled spectacle of multihued canyon walls, cut by the Colorado River to a depth of a mile and fretted by wind and rain to produce a scene that defies description; a magnificence beyond comprehension. Acadia, in Maine, is a varied exhibit of seacoast, mountain and eastern forest; this was the first land within the United States reached by Champlain in 1604. Zion and Bryce, in Utah, are characterized by vividly colored and fantastically carved canyon walls of sandstone. The Grand Teton National Park, in Wyoming, features the towering and most historic summit of the West. The Grand Teton was well known throughout the fur trade period (beginning 1807) to both American and British fur companies. Carlsbad Caverns^o, in New Mexico, are characterized by many miles of impressive chambers 1000 feet beneath the surface of the earth containing magnificent limestone formations of infinite variety of sizes and shapes. The bat spectacle is one of its great attractions. Great Smoky Mountains, North Carolina-Tennessee, include the most massive moun-

tain uplift in the eastern United States covered with characteristic Appalachian flora—which includes 152 varieties of trees. Shenandoah, in Virginia, preserves a section of the heart of the Blue Ridge Mountains. Other national parks not mentioned above, historical parks, national military parks, battlefield sites, national monuments^o, national cemeteries^o, the parks and parkways of the District of Columbia and several miscellaneous memorials make up the system of Federal areas administered by the National Park Service. About 16,000,000 people visited the national parks in 1939.

[Isabelle F. Story, *Glimpses of Our National Parks*; U. S. National Park Service, *Glimpses of Historical Areas East of the Mississippi River*, U. S. National Park Service, *Recreational Use of Land in the United States*.]

CARL P. RUSSELL

Parliament, The English, is significant in American history mainly as the embodiment of those rights and liberties possessed under the British constitution^o by all Englishmen. To the American colonist, who regarded these privileges as belonging to himself as well as to the Briton in Europe, it was a cherished ideal, and all the provincial assemblies save that of Pennsylvania accepted its bicameral^o principle. In fact, the chief object of every colonial assembly^o was to run a course similar to that of Parliament and secure the right to participate in the benefits that Parliament had wrested from the crown.

However, the part played by Parliament in the administration of the colonies before 1763 was very small, for North America was regarded as an appurtenance of the crown and governed by ordinances of the Privy Council^o. Only in matters of combined domestic and colonial interest, or involving the welfare of the empire as a whole, did Parliament legislate for the colonies, as in the Molasses Act^o of 1733, designed to promote trade between New England and the British West Indies and to benefit West Indian planters.

Not until the firm establishment of the principle of parliamentary supremacy in England, concurrent with the close of the French and Indian War^o, did Parliament seriously set itself to the direction of colonial affairs (*see* Colonial Policy, The British). It quickly made itself odious to Americans by asserting its authority in regard to colonial taxation and appropriation, which the assemblies had long looked upon as their exclusive domain. Americans felt that Parliament had no right to assume powers which the crown had formerly been unable to make good, and the uncompromising attitude of the Grenville Ministry over the Stamp Act^o (1765) precipitated

a crisis in which colonial opinion everywhere stiffened against Parliament. Two years later, the passage of the Townshend Acts⁹⁷ widened the breach, and in 1773 the resolution of the British prime minister, Lord North, to "try the issue [of taxation] in America" led directly to the Revolution⁹⁸.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*; L. W. Labaree, *Royal Government in America*.]

FRANK J. KLINGBERG

Parole System, THE, is a phase of penology usually associated with the indeterminate sentence, based upon the idea of making prisoners useful members of society. An offender is released (paroled) from prison upon certain conditions, but remains under supervision of state authorities during the balance of his term. If the conditions are violated, he may be returned to prison. First used in New York in 1876, parole has been adopted by most of the states and by the Federal Government.

[J. P. Bramer, *A Treatise Giving the History, Organization, and Administration of Parole*.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Parson Brownlow's Book was the popular short title of a powerful propaganda book written, in 1862, by William G. Brownlow, an unterrified and militant Civil War Unionist of Tennessee. Under the title of *Sketches of the Rise, Progress, and Decline of Secession; with a Narrative of Personal Adventures among the Rebels*, it was written and published while Parson Brownlow was an exile in the North. He studded its 458 pages with "rebel atrocities" and scathing denunciations of Confederates; and a New York artist re-enforced the effect with a dozen illustrations.

[E. M. Coulter, *William G. Brownlow, Fighting Parson of the Southern Highlands*.]

E. MERTON COULTER

Parson's Cause, THE, was a Virginia issue. Tobacco was a medium of exchange and ministers' salaries had been fixed (1748) at 17,200 pounds a year (*see Tobacco as Money*). To remedy the distress from fluctuating crops and prices, laws were passed in 1755 and again in 1758 permitting tobacco payments to be commuted in paper money at two pence per pound. As tobacco sold for six pence a pound the ministers considered themselves losers, assailed the law both in Virginia and England, and obtained a royal veto in 1759 (*see Royal Disallowance*), which was not published in Virginia till 1760. In the meantime, ministers' salaries for 1758 had been settled in paper money⁹⁹ at the prescribed rate. With the announcement of the veto, ministers started suits for the difference between what they were paid

and the value of their tobacco quota at current prices. In Hanover County the court ruled the act of 1758 was invalid from its passage, and the Rev. James Maury brought suit to recover on his salary (1763). Patrick Henry defended the parish, presenting no witnesses but assailing the ministers and the practice of vetoing laws necessary for the public good. The jury awarded Maury one penny damages. In 1764 the General Court of the province held the law good until it was vetoed and left the ministers without any remedy. This was appealed to the Privy Council¹⁰⁰ where the appeal was dismissed (1767). A general two-penny act was passed in 1769, and the ministers gave up the agitation. Henry's speech was publicized about fifty years later when he had become a national hero, and the reference in the Declaration of Independence¹⁰¹ to vetoing "laws the most wholesome and necessary for the public good" probably referred to this issue.

[George E. Howard, *Preliminaries of the Revolution*.]

O. M. DICKERSON

Parties, Political. *See* Political Parties.

Partisan Bands constitute a type of irregular soldiery found mainly in civil war and warfare in defense of invaded territory. In many ways partisan bands resemble guerrillas¹⁰² and are commonly accused by the enemy of carrying on guerrilla warfare, but a slight distinction exists. Guerrillas are sometimes unorganized or, if organized at all, somewhat independent of any regular army and thereby almost without any constituted authority, while partisan bands are loosely organized and nominally under some constituted government.

In American history partisan bands have played a romantic if somewhat indecisive role. They first appeared in the series of wars between the British and French which went on at intervals from 1689 to 1763. In these wars, groups of frontiersmen, in defense of their homesteads, formed irregular military bands. They called themselves and were by others called "rangers." Sometimes they made expeditions into the enemy's strongholds, as in John Armstrong's raid on Kittanning¹⁰³ in 1756. On the opening of hostilities in the American Revolution partisan bands appeared, among them the "Green Mountain Boys"¹⁰⁴ in the North and the followers of Pickens, Marion and Sumter in the South. In the Civil War partisan bands or corps came into existence, of which Mosby's Rangers¹⁰⁵ were merely the most famous. Smaller bands existed in Kentucky, Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas and the Indian territory. Of these Albert Pike's partisan band of Confed-

erates, composed largely of Indians, was possibly the most significant.

At the Hague Conferences⁹⁷ of 1899 and 1907 efforts were made to bring partisan bands or guerrillas under regular military rules and control.

ALFRED P. JAMES

Party Emblems. See Emblems, Party.

Party Government. In the United States, party government dates from the latter part of Washington's first administration, when two rival political parties, the Federalists and (Jeffersonian) Republicans⁹⁸, began to take shape. Since then, down to the present day, two rival major parties, under varying names—Whig, Democratic, Republican⁹⁹—have sought to control government through the winning of elections and the holding of public offices. American parties, however, have formed no part of the Government, as do British political parties; they have existed, rather, as extraconstitutional and largely extralegal institutions. Nevertheless, all through our national history, parties have tended to reduce the friction and deadlocks that result from the constitutional separation of executive and legislative departments. Party government has functioned at its best, in the national sphere, during periods when the President and a majority of both branches of Congress have belonged to the same party; and likewise in state affairs, when a corresponding situation has existed. On numerous occasions, party attitudes upon governmental policies, expressed in party platforms¹⁰⁰, have determined the fate of momentous national issues; although since the Civil War, platform utterances have generally been of less significance than in the thirty years preceding. In fact, all through our national history, the chief function of political parties has not been so much to declare what laws shall be made, nor to control those who administer them, as to choose the persons who are to make the laws and to name those who are to administer them. Party responsibility, as the term is used in British politics, however, can hardly be said to have existed at any time in the United States. In the latter, party government has appeared far less in the formulation of legislative and administrative policies than in electoral activity. Indeed, American parties have always been primarily agencies for the nomination and election of candidates for national, state and local government offices, for placing party adherents in appointive positions and for serving in a way as sureties for the faithful performance of official duties.

For more than 100 years, electoral activities

have been carried on through a national nominating convention¹⁰¹ and a series of national party committees, supplemented by an elaborate scheme of state, county and local committees. In the executive and administrative branch of government, parties have been chiefly concerned with the nomination and election of President, Vice-President, state governors and the other chief state officers, also with the appointment of fellow partisans to the thousands of subordinate administrative posts. In Congress and the state legislatures, party government has meant not only the nomination and election of members through party agencies (except in recent years in Minnesota and Nebraska), but also that in each legislature the dominant party has chosen the presiding officers, named the various legislative committees, and filled the numerous staff positions with members of the party. Frequently such arrangements have been effected, and party attitudes upon outstanding measures have been determined, through the agency of an irresponsible majority-party caucus. The vast majority of legislative measures, both in Congress and state legislatures, have always been of a nonpartisan nature. Party government, in the sense in which the term is here used, has also long existed in counties and municipalities, although, in recent decades, it has been superseded to some extent by a system of nonpartisan nomination and election of county and local officials.

In performing these electoral functions, American parties have furnished the motive power that runs the inert governmental machine outlined in the national and state constitutions, and has provided a lubricant that has kept its various parts operating with some degree of smoothness. From their first appearance, moreover, parties have been the most important channel through which the ordinary citizen has been able to exert a direct influence upon the policies and conduct of public officials.

[H. J. Ford, *Rise and Growth of American Politics*; W. Wilson, *Constitutional Government in the United States*; P. H. Odegard and E. A. Helms, *American Politics*; A. N. Holcombe, *The Political Parties of Today*; C. E. Merriam and H. F. Gosnell, *The American Party System*; C. W. McKenzie, *Party Government in the United States*; P. O. Ray, *Introduction to Political Parties and Practical Politics*.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Pass Christian, about sixty miles east of New Orleans, was an early French settlement on the Gulf Coast. The United States flag was hoisted here on Jan. 9, 1811, after the annexation of West Florida¹⁰², and British and American fleets fought a battle here on Dec. 14, 1814 (see Borgne,

Lake, Battle of), just prior to the British attack upon New Orleans⁹⁷.

[Dunbar Rowland, ed., *Mississippi*, Cyclopedic, Vol. II; Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi, The Heart of the South*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Passamaquoddy. Suggestions were made early to utilize the high tides in the Bay of Fundy for power. Dexter P. Cooper, who had helped his brother build big dams here and in Russia, became interested in 1912. He chartered a Maine company in 1925 and a Canadian company in 1926. The first plan used Passamaquoddy Bay in Canada and Cobscook Bay in the United States to get continuous generation of power. The Federal Power Commission⁹⁸ granted a preliminary permit in May, 1926. After about \$500,000 had been spent the depression after 1929 stopped the activities of the private company. An international commission appointed in 1930 to consider whether the project would hurt fishing reported that it would. Then a plan was devised which used only American waters.

As a recovery project, President F. D. Roosevelt approved a Public Works Administration⁹⁹ allotment in 1935. Work was started in 1935 and suspended in 1937. "Quoddy" village was constructed for the workers and three small dams were built. The stoppage was due to the refusal of Congress to authorize additional money.

[N. H. Dole and I. L. Gordon, *Maine of the Sea and Pines*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Passes, Mountain. America is traversed from north to south by two mountain chains, the Appalachians and Rockies, which formed barriers to the westward movement¹⁰⁰. Early hunters in search of pelts, and pioneers¹⁰¹ who coveted western lands, met the difficulty by finding natural outlets through the mountains. In the Appalachians these were generally called "gaps" and in the Rockies "passes." Early trails were, when possible, water trails so that the Mohawk and the Ohio rivers were the key routes to the Great Lakes and the Mississippi Valley¹⁰². The Iroquois and French barred the Mohawk route on the north, as did the Cherokees¹⁰³ and other confederated tribes the lowlands south of the Appalachians. Accordingly, the confluence of the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers to form the Ohio at Pittsburgh (*see* Ohio, Forks of the), and the breaks in the mountain ridges in the corner between Virginia and North Carolina leading into Kentucky, were the points of easiest passage. Such gaps in the Appalachians were frequently the result of troughs cut through the mountain slopes by rivers seeking an outlet to the Ohio or

the Atlantic Ocean. The Virginia coast range was low but early maps show three passes into the Shenandoah Valley—Williams, Ashby and Vestal gaps, all in Fairfax County.

The most important pass in the Kentucky approach is the Cumberland Gap¹⁰⁴ which led by way of the Holston and Clinch rivers over and through the mountains and thence along Kentucky rivers to the Falls of the Ohio¹⁰⁵. This was known as Boone's Wilderness Road¹⁰⁶ and gaps noted by early travelers include Flower gap, from tidewater to the sources of Little River; Blue Ridge gap, another passage from tidewater to the Shenandoah Valley; Moccasin Gap between the north fork of the Holston and Clinch rivers.

On the Virginia road by Braddock's route¹⁰⁷ to Pittsburgh were encountered Chester's gap in the Blue Ridge Mountains. On the Forbes road¹⁰⁸, running west from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, Miller's Run gap was crossed northwest of the present site of Ligonier.

The Rockies, because of their uninterrupted length and great height, offered a more serious problem. Their secrets were unlocked for the most part by early Spanish missionaries at the south; fur traders, emigrants and army explorers at the north and center. The earliest approaches were made in the south by the Spaniards pushing into California from New Mexico¹⁰⁹. After Mexico revolted and American trade with Santa Fé¹¹⁰ began, fur trappers thrust westward from Taos¹¹¹ and Santa Fé to San Diego and Los Angeles. The river valleys unlocking the southern route to the West were the Gila and the Colorado. The Colorado trail, known as the Spanish trail, went north from Taos, crossed the Wasatch Mountains and Mohave desert and entered California by the Cajon pass. The Gila route¹¹² which was the shorter from Santa Fé went west across the mountains and, by way of Warner's pass, reached San Diego.

By following the Arkansas River west to Pueblo, Colo., and crossing the mountains by a choice of three or four different passes—the Williams or Sandy Hill, the Roubideau or Mosca, the Sangre de Cristo or Music passes—Taos could be reached by turning south, or California by turning northwest on a route traced by Frémont¹¹³. This route crossed the Great Basin¹¹⁴ of Utah and Nevada and surmounted the high Sierra Nevada passes. The most important of these passes were the Walker, the Carson, the Virginia, the Frémont, the Sonora, the Donner and the Truckee. After the eastern escarpment had been scaled, there still remained mountain folds in the Sierras which impeded progress to the coast. The Teha-

chapi pass into San Joaquin Valley crossed one such fold.

The central approach to the Rockies is by way of the Platte River[™] which sends fingers high up into the mountains. The most important pass in the entire Rocky Mountain chain, South Pass[™], is on this route. It has easy grades and was used by many bound for California who turned south at Fort Hall[™], Idaho (*see Oregon Trail*).

Of all river approaches the Missouri is the most effective and was the route used by Lewis and Clark[™] who crossed the Rockies by Lemhi, Clark and Gibbon passes. Other useful passes of the northwest are the Nez Percés and Lo Lo through the Bitter Root Mountains. The Bozeman[™] pass offers access from the valley of the Gallatin to that of the Yellowstone. For traveling south from Oregon to California the Siskyou pass proved useful.

Important passes in the mid-continental region are the Union, crossing the Wind River Mountains from Wind River to the Grand; Cochetope pass over the San Juan Mountains, used by Frémont and others in passing from Colorado to Utah; and Muddy pass, two degrees south of South Pass, useful in crossing the Atlantic and Pacific divides from Platte headwaters. Bridger's pass, discovered in the early days of the fur trade, crossed the divide south of South Pass and saved distance on the California route and, in consequence, was used by the Pony Express[™].

[E. W. Gilbert, *Exploration of Western America*; F. S. Dellenbaugh, *Frémont and '49*; A. B. Hulburt, *Historic Highways of America*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Passports were issued by local authorities and notaries as well as the Secretary of State until 1856 when, due to the refusal of foreign governments to recognize those issued by local authorities, issuance was confined to the State Department. Except for the Civil War period, passports were not required of foreign travelers in the United States until 1918. The requirement was made permanent in 1921.

[E. M. Borchard, *The Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad*.]

L. J. MEYER

Patent Medicine. This term legally interpreted would refer only to those medicines whose method of making or the resulting composition or both have been patented. Patent medicine, in the popular sense, refers to all those proprietary medicines whose names have been registered at Washington and therefore become the maker's property in perpetuity. The proprietor can change his formula and still retain the name. The patent-medicine business developed rapidly in the United States during the period 1815 to 1860,

and newspapers of this period carried advertisements of remedies for every real or imaginary disease. Alcohol was the principal ingredient of many cure-alls. Some proprietary remedies were harmless, but others caused sickness and in some cases resulted in death. Medical societies began the fight against patent medicines as early as 1815 but nothing substantial was accomplished until the American Medical Association began its investigations in 1905. As a result of its reports, and the exposé published in popular magazines, public opinion was aroused and in 1906 the Pure Food and Drug Act[™] was passed. Under this law certain standards were set up to protect against adulteration[™], and false or misleading statements were not permitted on the labels. The act, however, did not prevent false and misleading statements in advertising. An amendment to the original act was passed in 1912 prohibiting the false and fraudulent labeling of patent medicines, and another passed in 1913 required that the net weight of package drugs be stated on the container. In 1938 a more comprehensive Food and Drug Bill was before Congress, but proponents of more effective legislation declared that the proposed amendments would destroy the effectiveness of the bill. One controversial feature, however, was settled by the passage of the Wheeler-Lea amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, which enables the Commission to deal with fraudulent advertising.

[S. H. Adams, *The Great American Fraud*.]

THEODORE G. GRONERT

Patent Office, The United States, was established by the law of 1836 when it took over the files of the earlier patent registration office of the State Department. It was a bureau of that department until 1849 when it was transferred to the newly organized Interior Department where it remained until 1925. Since then it has been attached to the Department of Commerce. The office was one of the first in Washington to occupy its own building. Its early publications contain much information of historical interest. It grants or denies applications for patents upon examination for originality and utility; is custodian of specifications, models and other patent records; and interprets patent law subject to court decisions. Its receipts from fees often exceed its expenditures and yield net revenue to the Government. In addition to trade-mark[™] registrations it issues about 40,000 patents annually of which between 6000 and 7000 are for designs.

[Levin H. Campbell, *The Patent System of the United States*; Gustavus A. Weber, *The Patent Office*.]

VICTOR S. CLARK

Patents. The American patent system evolved from monopolies established by colonial legislatures to encourage new industries. These privileges, which were granted rarely and for limited periods, were intended to attract a manufacture from abroad, to promote a familiar but neglected industry, or to protect a new invention. Shortly before the Constitution was adopted several states issued patents for mechanical inventions like those granted to Oliver Evans for improvements in mill machinery and in steam engines, and to Fitch and to Rumsey for steamboats⁹⁹⁹.

Congress at its second session, in 1790, under constitutional authority "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their writings and discoveries," enacted a law empowering a board of cabinet officers to issue patents to inventors who proved to its satisfaction that their devices were novel and useful. This board could reject claims for patents at its discretion. Three years later Congress passed a new law more in conformity with English practice which required the Secretary of State to issue a patent to any applicant who complied with prescribed formalities, leaving it to the courts to void the patent if the recipient failed to prove that he had invented "a new and useful art, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement" thereof. Under this law's loose provisions, litigation multiplied and conflicting and fraudulent patents were numerous. Nevertheless, it protected the development of American inventions of historic interest, such as the power loom, the ring spindle, and the Goulding condenser, which greatly contributed to the success of the nation's young textile industry⁹⁹⁹.

In 1836 a new law was enacted which created a patent bureau, required that patents be issued only after examination and proof of merit and originality, and provided for caveats to protect the rights of inventors while maturing their inventions. Although frequently amended and revised, this act founded the American patent system (see Patent Office, The United States). Under its encouragement and protection some of the greatest inventions of the last 100 years were made and developed. These include the harvester, first patented by Cyrus Hall McCormick in 1834 but perfected later, the electric telegraph patented by Samuel F. B. Morse in 1840, the Goodyear rubber patents granted in 1841, the sewing machine patented by Elias Howe in 1846, the telephone patented by Alexander Graham Bell in 1876, Thomas A. Edison's patents for the phonograph in 1878 and the incandescent lamp⁹⁹⁹

in 1880, and electric welding patented by Elihu Thomson in 1886. Outstanding individual inventions have been less prominent in recent patent history since technical discoveries have become increasingly the co-operative product of research laboratories and are often subsidiary to groups of improvements of which they are essential but partial elements.

A distinctive feature of American legislation has been the improvement patent which enables the originator of a new idea to benefit from his contribution to the betterment of already protected processes and devices. This fosters a democracy of invention difficult to achieve where the first patentee can restrain the use of improvements made by others in his field, encourages co-operation among contributors to technical development and discourages monopolies. A classical early illustration of this occurred in 1856 when the owners of the leading sewing-machine patents, of which there were already several, united in an agreement to protect their interests against infringers, and also to grant licenses to use their patents at uniform royalties to others who desired to engage in the business. After their introduction in America in 1865 the fundamental Bessemer steel⁹⁹⁹ patents were owned by an incorporated group of producers each of whom was free to develop his own improvements. Somewhat similar arrangements sometimes embracing international associates exist in such important industries as the manufacture of automobiles, electrical apparatus and chemicals. Companies like Standard Oil, American Telegraph and Telephone, Radio Corporation, and Dupont⁹⁹⁹ may own hundreds of patents which constitute a major item of their assets.

Patents reflect stages of industrial progress. In the colonies where only simple hand tools were employed such rights were usually to processes like making salt or potash, or for improvements in agricultural implements. With the advent of power machinery, mechanical devices took front place in the patent picture. Now that industrial advance is often associated with the transmutation of materials, metallurgical and chemical processes have come to the fore. Some of these, like methods of reducing aluminum perfected by Americans in the early 1880's, have had revolutionary results.

Patents shaped American industrial organization. They created the early machine shops at Lowell, Taunton and Providence, and continue to be nuclei of great factories as well as great industries. Today, however, the nation has reached a stage of industrial maturity when many corporations have outlived their original patents and

owe their success to later inventions and improvements.

[Levin H. Campbell, *The Patent System of the United States*; H. and C. Howson, *A Brief Inquiry into the Principle, Effects and Present State of the American Patent System*; Frank Keiper, *Pioneer Inventions and Pioneer Patents*.]

VICTOR S. CLARK

Paterson Plan, THE. See Convention of 1787.

"Pathfinder, The," was a soubriquet given to John Charles Frémont following the publication, in 1845, by the United States Government of his *Report of the exploring expedition to the Rocky Mountains in the year 1842, and to Oregon and north California in the years 1843-44*, which met with instant popularity and quickly ran through four editions.

[Allan Nevins, *John Charles Frémont*.]

OSGOOD HARDY

Pathfinder of the Seas. See Maury's Charts.

"Patriot War," THE, of 1837 and 1838, had repercussions as late as 1841. Spurred on by a mistaken conception of the reasons for the Canadian rebellions, by a desire to free Canada from British control, by the promise of bounties in money and land, and by Canadian refugees who joined in the fray, the "Patriots," mostly farmers and unemployed artisans, were recruited in the border counties from Vermont to Michigan. Without the benefit of united and effective leadership and with inadequate and undisciplined ranks, they made three different extensive plans in 1838 for widespread contemporaneous attacks along the Canadian border, with a view to eventual joining of forces and establishment of a republic in Canada. With the failure of these plans, the movement came completely under the domination of the "Hunters"^{qv}. International complications were averted as a consequence of the co-operation and vigorous action of the British and American authorities. Congress passed a stronger neutrality act, and Federal troops were sent to the frontier. In the border states the militia was called out, and civil and criminal suits were instituted. On their side, the Canadian and British authorities used military and civil measures to prevent retaliatory attacks (*see Canadian-American Relations*).

[Orrin E. Tiffany, *The Relations of the United States to the Canadian Rebellion of 1837-38*, in *Buffalo Historical Society Publications*, VIII.]

ALBERT B. COREY

Patriots, THE. During the colonial period Tories and Whigs, sometimes referred to respec-

tively as the court and country parties, contested sharply for political power. With the advent of the Revolution the former came to be known as Loyalists^{qv}, the latter as Patriots. Devoted to the cause of independence with widely varying degrees of fervor the Patriots were recruited largely from middle, lower-class and non-conformist elements. Among their leaders, however, were many men of family, substance and Anglican affiliation. During the Revolution both Patriots and Loyalists, especially the former, departed from methods of peaceful persuasion characteristic of political parties, descending to the lowest forms of terrorism and violence.

[S. G. Fisher, *The Struggle for American Independence*.]

ROBERT C. BROOKS

Patronage, Political, in the United States, includes all the forms of largesse at the disposal of successful candidates for public office. In the absence of limitations upon the officer, all public jobs and all public contracts are subject to disposal at the whim of the principal officer of the governmental unit involved. In such cases they are usually employed to further the personal interests of the officer or the interests of the party which he represents. This is known as the "spoils system"^{qv} from the remark of Sen. Marcy of New York, "To the victor belong the spoils." This plan was first employed on a large scale in the National Government of the United States during the administration of President Andrew Jackson. The cities and states were not slow to learn the new system. In 1880 governments were in many cases merely the adjuncts of the corrupt political machines. Taxpayers were paying not for public services but for the support of political parties^{qv}.

The assassination^{qv} of President Garfield in 1880 by a disappointed office seeker awakened the people, and even Congress, to the baneful effects of an unrestricted spoils system. In 1883 Congress adopted the Pendleton Act^{qv} providing for the creation of a civil service commission of three members, for the establishment of the principle of open competitive examinations for admission to public employment, and for the protection of these classified civil servants from discrimination or removal on account of political or religious beliefs.

The employees of Congress and of the Federal courts are not included in the classified civil service. There is a distinct tendency toward nepotism and political patronage in filling positions in Congress.

State governments in the United States still use the patronage system in the main. Compara-

tively few states have adopted merit system^{as} laws and even in some of those which do have such statutes they are not consistently enforced.

Cities have been subjected to tremendous public pressure to remove public employment from patronage. Practically all large cities have set up personnel agencies, some of which are effective in establishing and protecting a true merit system. Counties have been the strongholds of political parties and as such are slow to adopt civil service. Only a few of the more than 3000 American counties use the merit system. Other governmental units, such as the New England town and the school district, either have a tradition to maintain or a standard to meet. There is patronage in the schools, but minimum standards must be met, in order to secure state subsidies. Small cities and villages are ordinarily too small and too weak financially to support an effective personnel program. Hence their few positions are usually available as patronage for the mayor. The adoption of the city manager^{as} plan in these small cities has often resulted in a merit system without civil service.

It should not be assumed that persons appointed to public office for political reasons are all incompetent. Many of the most devoted and capable public servants of our country have secured their appointments through patronage. But the chance that such persons will be secured is obviously smaller when political considerations must be met than when competence is the primary criterion.

Patronage in public employment is used for many purposes. The political parties assume its necessity to maintain the faithfulness of party workers. Officeholders use it to build machines which can assure their renomination. Votes are purchased just as effectively by a place on the public payroll as with cash—and the cost is shifted from the party treasury to the taxpayers (see Campaign Resources and Uses). Even our most revered Presidents have not hesitated to use their power of appointment to purchase congressional support for their policies.

Patronage does not consist entirely of jobbery in public employment. While this phase does tend to cement the loyalty of individuals to the machine^{as} which is responsible for their appointment, it does not provide the large sums of money needed by the party for the conduct of political campaigns. Only a small portion of the money can be supplied by political assessments^{as} upon politically appointed officeholders. The larger part must come from those who have received or who expect to receive some financial benefit from the operation of the government.

The awarding of contracts or orders for the supplies, material and equipment needed for government use to political supporters and favorites is usually followed by rebates^{as} or contributions to campaign funds.

The limitation of official discretion in such matters usually takes the form of a law requiring publicity for all requirements of the government, the acceptance of competitive bids and the awarding of the contract to the lowest and most responsible bidder. Such laws are in effect for large purchases by the National Government, most of the states, large cities, counties and school districts. They can be and are evaded. Only intensive vigilance by interested taxpayers can assure their impartial and continuous application. (See also Rings, Political.)

[W. E. Mosher and J. D. Kingsley, *Public Personnel Administration*; Luther Gulick, ed., *Better Government Personnel*; F. M. Stewart, *The National Civil Service Reform League*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Patrons of Husbandry, THE, beginning as a farmers' lodge, was founded Dec. 4, 1867, in Washington, D. C., and served as the vehicle through which the Granger Movement^{as} operated. It had a secret ritual like the Masons, and admitted both men and women to membership. Each local unit was known as a "Grange." In 1876 the order reached its peak membership of 858,050, but by 1880 the collapse of the Granger Movement had reduced this figure to 124,420. Thereafter, by abandoning business and politics for its original program of social and educational reforms, the order began a slow and steady growth which, by 1934, enabled it to claim again over 800,000 members, mainly in New England, the North Central states, and the Pacific Northwest. Of late years it has not hesitated to support legislation, both state and national, deemed of benefit to the farmers.

[Edward Wiest, *Agricultural Organization in the United States*.]

JOHN D. HICKS

Patroons. On June 7, 1629, the directorate of the West India Company^{as} granted, and the States General of the Netherlands approved, a Charter of Freedoms and Exemptions, which provided for the grant of great estates, called patroonships, to such members of the company as should found settlements of fifty persons within four years after giving notice of their intentions. The patroon, after he had extinguished the Indian title by purchase, was to hold the land as a "perpetual fief of inheritance" with the fruits, plants, minerals, rivers and springs, thereof. He swore fealty to the company and had the right

of the high, middle and low jurisdiction. Before the end of January, 1630, patroonships had been registered by Pauw, for Sickenames and Pavonia; by Godyn, for the west side of the Delaware River; by Albert Coenraets Burgh, on the east side of the Delaware River; by Blommaert, for the Connecticut River; and by Van Rensselaer for Rensselaerswyck, about Fort Orange. With the single exception of Rensselaerswyck, these grants were unsuccessful. The difficulties of transportation across the Atlantic Ocean, lack of co-operation from the company, quarrels with the authorities at New Amsterdam²⁰, Indian troubles, and the difficulties of management from 3000 miles away, were all factors in their failure. In 1640 the revised charter reduced the size of future patroonships, but the same factors contributed to prevent the success of these smaller grants. At the close of Dutch rule all but two of the patroonships had been repurchased by the company.

[A. C. Flick, ed., *History of the State of New York*, Vol. I.]

A. C. FLICK

Paulists, THE, are members of the Society of Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle, founded in 1858 in New York City by Father Isaac T. Hecker, a convert. Their chief aim is to labor for the conversion of the American people to Catholicism. Besides parish work, they have given missions and lectures to non-Catholics, established the *Catholic World* in 1865, the Catholic Publication Society in 1866 and their own printing press in 1892. They operated their own radio station in New York City from 1925 to 1937.

[Walter Elliott, *Life of Father Hecker*; James M. Gillis, *The Paulists*; Paulist Fathers, *The Paulists and Their Work*.]

VINCENT F. HOLDEN

Paulus Hook, Surprise of (Aug. 19, 1779) The British forts on lower Manhattan and at Paulus Hook, N. J., directly opposite, commanded the entrance to the Hudson River. In a bayonet attack at dawn, Maj. Henry Lee, with 200 men, surprised the garrison at Paulus Hook, captured 159 prisoners and regained New Bridge (Hackensack) with loss of two men. Congress rewarded Lee with a gold medal and distributed \$15,000 among his men. Stony Point²¹ and Paulus Hook made the enemy cautious and limited the field of his activities.

[F. B. Lee, *New Jersey as a Colony and as a State*, Vol. II.]

C. A. TITUS

Pauperism and Poverty. In the American colonies the poor were handled, in general, according to the principles of the English Poor

Laws. Relief was given by the local public authorities. Settlement laws restricted such relief to those who had a legal residence in the township or other local unit where help was asked. Local autonomy prevailed, and the adequacy and detailed methods of relief varied with localities. The first responsibility for the support of the poor was placed by law upon the relatives. The principle of "less eligibility" was followed, namely, that "the condition of paupers shall in no case be so eligible as the condition of persons of the lowest class subsisting on the fruits of their own industry." In early days poor families were often broken up, the members being auctioned off by the town into the care of various householders. The towns made strenuous efforts to keep out indigent strangers. Vagrancy laws, which, contrary to the main principles of Anglo-American law, may punish persons whose only offense is loitering about "without visible means of support," were established, and are still used in some places.

Two methods gradually developed. One was "out-door relief," which is relief to the poor in their own homes, keeping the family intact. This is now called "home relief." The other was the establishment by various local units of government of almshouses, which at first housed a great variety of destitute persons who could not conveniently be cared for otherwise. Almshouse care was known as "indoor relief."

During the 19th century there were many abuses and inefficiencies in the care of the poor. Relief was sometimes extravagant and wasteful, sometimes tinged with favoritism, sometimes niggardly and inadequate. Children and other helpless persons were often sadly neglected, herded indiscriminately in almshouses, or otherwise inhumanely treated. About 1860 began a movement toward the centralized control of poor relief. State boards of charities were established, beginning with the Massachusetts board in 1863. These boards, which have commonly developed into state departments of social welfare, had the power to supervise local poor relief and almshouses. They have gradually obtained by law greater control and have helped to bring about greater uniformity and higher standards among the local authorities of their respective states. By means of other legislation, children were removed from almshouses; specialized procedures or institutions were set up to care for children, the sick poor, the insane, the feeble-minded and the epileptic. The almshouse has now become mainly a refuge for the aged poor who are too helpless to be provided for by home relief or old age assistance.

The development of official state control has

been helped in some states by voluntary, unofficial bodies, such as the New York State Charities Aid Association, established in 1872, which serves to interpret, to guide and to fill gaps in the tax-supported work.

Government, however, has not been the only support of the poor. It had, in fact, inherited this function in large part from the church (in England) about the time of Queen Elizabeth. But the church, with its various orders and societies, has continued to give much charitable aid; families have continued to care for poor relatives, though relatively less than formerly, labor unions and fraternal orders have served as channels of mutual aid. Moreover, there has always been a certain amount of personal charity, often prompted by the religious spirit, sometimes by family pride, but free in the choice of the object of its bounty. Friends, neighbors and mendicant strangers have been supported by this voluntary private charity. With the growth of English and American cities in the 19th century, private charity presented new problems. Philanthropic resources increased as wealth concentrated, yet the persons in need of help became segregated in slums, and more separated from personal contact with their potential benefactors.

Out of this situation arose a new type of organization in the 1850's, the general urban relief-giving society, commonly known as "Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor," "Provident Society," and the like. In 1877, the establishment of the Charity Organization Society of Buffalo inaugurated still another step in the organization of the voluntary aid of the urban poor. The Charity Organization societies united many small charities, religious and secular, in city-wide co-operation, reduced the overlapping of their work, promoted the keeping of case records and the more just and adequate distribution of relief, exposed dishonest mendicants and fraudulent charities and sought to prevent pauperism. They spent their own funds mainly on service and prevention rather than as cash and goods for the clients.

The National Conference of Charities and Correction (now National Conference of Social Work) was founded in 1873 to bring together workers from various fields with interested citizens, and to promote nationwide co-ordination and raising of standards. From then until the present day our treatment of dependency has undergone continuous processes of greater specialization, on the one hand, and greater federation and integration, on the other. In so doing it has interwoven itself with our treatment of defectives, of delinquents and criminals, and even

with many activities devoted to the "normal" population. "Charity" has thus become merged into "social welfare."

About 1909 began the movement to co-ordinate the wide varieties of public and private social work in the local community through establishment of a local "Council of Social Agencies" or "Welfare Council." Joint money raising for private agencies, while tried several times in various ways, reached its first notable success in Cleveland in 1913, and now nearly all cities of over 100,000 have "Community Chests."²⁰

While "private" organizations have done the pioneer work and developed new standards, public welfare work has advanced more rapidly than private in the quantity of service involved. Notable developments of the 20th century are mothers' allowances or "aid to dependent children," begun first on a state-wide basis in 1911; state old age assistance, beginning in the 1920's; the widespread substitution of county departments of public welfare for the more local and unprofessional poor-law authorities; the state and Federal emergency relief activities of the 1930's; and the Federal Social Security Act²¹ of 1935, which, by conditionally subsidizing state programs, has introduced higher standards of public welfare, and has replaced general relief to a considerable extent by categorical relief and social insurance.

It has been estimated that even in the prosperous year of 1929, 40% of the American people were living upon a level of bare subsistence or worse, meaning not over \$1500 income for a family, or \$750 for a single individual. Poverty is a relative condition. Planes of living have risen in all classes during the past hundred years; starvation and the grosser forms of want have largely disappeared, yet the poor we still have with us. Poverty exists wherever income is not high enough to permit a family to maintain its health and efficiency under the conditions and standards set by the society of which it is a part. Under normal conditions, before 1929, from 2% to 5% of the population were in receipt of relief, public or private. Two and one half per cent is a conservative estimate of the basic proportion of "paupers," or chronic dependents upon public relief, which are always with us. The depression, however, brought about an unprecedented situation. Seventeen per cent of the population were on emergency relief early in 1935, and persons receiving other kinds of aid would have swollen the total to something like a fifth or more of the total population at that time (*see Relief*).

Our philosophy regarding pauperism and poverty has changed greatly. Before, and in, the 19th century, people were largely concerned with dis-

tinguishing the "worthy" from the "unworthy," and advocated stiff deterrents to prevent voluntary pauperism. Enumerations of the causes of poverty in those days sharply distinguished "misconduct" from "misfortune." The humanitarian movement²⁰, which blossomed in American cities in the latter part of the 19th century and furthered the development of private charities, softened the rigor of these distinctions, and widened the classes of dependents who were looked upon as victims of circumstances and deserving of sympathetic treatment.

During this period, middle and upper class women gave time as well as money to charity; much of the visiting done by private charities was volunteer work. With the 20th century the treatment of the poor became more scientific and realistic, less moralistic and sentimental. It did not become less humane, but rather more effectively humane. Professional "social workers" replaced volunteer "charity visitors." "Paupers" and "dependents" became "clients." The "almshouse" became the "city home." "Orphan asylums" became "children's homes." "Charities and corrections" became "social welfare." "Associated Charities" became "Family Welfare Societies."

Modern social work sees every case, whether he be "dependent," "defective," or "delinquent," or just an average citizen with a problem, as a human being (or family) fundamentally deserving of understanding and treatment.

[Robert W. Kelso, *History of Public Poor Relief in Massachusetts, 1620-1920*, and *The Science of Public Welfare*; Amos G. Warner, Stuart A. Queen and Ernest B. Harper, *American Charities and Social Work*; James H. S. Bossard, *Social Change and Social Problems*; John L. Gillin, *Poverty and Dependency*; *Social Work Yearbook*.]

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM

Paving. All the earliest paving in America seems to have been done with cobblestones. The first mention of paving is found in a court record in New Amsterdam²¹ in 1655, a reference to repairs of the paving in Pearl Street. Brouwer Street was paved with cobbles in 1658 and thereafter called Stone Street, even to the present time. Several other short New York streets were paved before 1700. In Boston, State and Washington streets were undoubtedly cobble-paved in the 17th century. In 1719 it was said that some citizens of Philadelphia had laid stone to the middle of the street in front of their own property, but the city was notorious for mud for many decades thereafter. On some city streets, very narrow brick or slab stone sidewalks were laid as early as 1700—often long before the vehicle way was even macadamized. Some macadamizing with broken stone or gravel and some cobble paving were done

in the 18th century, but even in 1800 most city streets were still given over to dust or mud. In fact, some downtown business streets in New York were quagmires as late as 1850, and in Chicago for long after that. In 1832 what is said to have been the first granite or "Belgian block" pavement in America was laid in New York. That city also introduced wood paving in 1835, laid in hexagonal blocks—said to be a "Russian idea." Later, square blocks were used. Wooden paving was easy on horses, and the clumping of their hoofs was muffled by it, but in wet weather it was apt to swell and rise in hillocks. With the coming of the automobile and the disappearance of the horse, the arguments for it lost force. When Chicago burned in 1871²², the weather had been so dry that even the wooden paving burned. In New Orleans, built on soft alluvial soil, many streets were surfaced with thick wooden planks laid crosswise—some streets until well into the 20th century. The first brick street paving was laid in Charleston, W. Va., in 1870. When asphalt was first tried in New York in 1877, it was pronounced a failure; but it shortly afterward became popular, though its habit of softening and consequent roughening in hot weather was a defect. After 1900 it began slowly to be replaced by concrete, which for some years had been vying with sawed Bedford stone in popularity for sidewalks. Various mixtures of crushed stone with tar, bitumen, asphalt, cement, etc., were developed for streets and roads as the automobile era dawned, but for the main highways, concrete came to be the only material considered. Glass paving bricks were announced in 1905, but never came into use, and rubber paving was tried in 1923.

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Pavonia Massacre (Feb. 25, 1643). About 1000 Indians, fleeing in midwinter from the Mohawks²³, had sought refuge among the Dutch farmers at Pavonia (now Jersey City), who fed them and treated them kindly. One night a party of Dutch soldiers, by order of Gov. Kieft, fell upon these innocent and unsuspecting people, murdering and horribly mutilating a large number of them, including women and children. In revenge, the Indians, for eighteen months, waged relentless war and devastated the countryside from the Raritan River to the Connecticut.

[C. H. Winfield, *History of the County of Hudson, N. Y.*]

C. A. TITUS

Pawnee Indians, THE, one of the great groups of plains Indians, were a confederacy of the Cadogan family, named probably for the stiffened scalp lock worn erect, curved like a horn. In the

emigration of the Caddoan family, the Pawnees settled along the valley of the Platte River with the Cheyennes and Arapahoes^{qq} to the west, the Omahas to the east and the Otoes and Kansas to the south. With establishment of the Oregon Trail^{qq} across their country, the Pawnees succumbed early to the vices and diseases of the white man, and were left, finally, a handful of their once large population.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*.]

JOHN FRANCIS, JR.

Pawnee Rock was a famous pioneer landmark of uplifted sandstone, since largely quarried away, on the old Santa Fé Trail^{qq} near what is now Pawnee Rock, Kans. It was not only the scene of bloody tribal warfare, especially between the Pawnees and Cheyennes^{qq}, but was notorious in frontier days as furnishing cover from which marauding bands of plains Indians frequently launched savage attacks upon passing wagon trains.

[Henry Inman, *The Old Santa Fé Trail*.]

JOHN FRANCIS, JR.

Pawtucket, R. I. Here, at the head of navigation on the Blackstone River four miles north of Providence, Samuel Slater installed the first Arkwright machinery^{qq} in America, 1790. Pawtucket thus became the cradle of what was for several generations New England's leading industry.

[George S. White, *Memoir of Samuel Slater, the Father of American Manufactures*; Robert Grieve, *Illustrated History of Pawtucket*.]

VICTOR S. CLARK

Paxton Boys. During the so-called Pontiac Conspiracy^{qq} (1763) the frontier of Pennsylvania felt for the second time in its history the horrors of Indian warfare. Henry Bouquet, a seasoned soldier, defeated the Indians at Bushy Run^{qq} on Aug. 5, the most important engagement with the Indians in the history of Pennsylvania. While the Indian raids lasted, Shippensburg was crowded with 1300 fugitives, Carlisle was filled. These depredations filled the frontiersmen, chiefly Scots-Irish^{qq}, with an intense hatred of Indians: they demanded a scalp bounty^{qq} and utter extermination of the natives. Out of this grew the Conestoga Massacre^{qq}—the killing of twenty defenseless and peaceable Conestoga Indians, who lived by their handicrafts near Lancaster. Some fifty-seven rangers from Paxton committed this atrocity in 1763. Gov. Penn issued two proclamations commanding magistrates to bring the culprits to trial, but the juries and justices of the frontier towns were sympathetic,

and nothing was done. Aside from the brutality of this event, it possesses importance as an evidence of the hatred of the frontiersmen for the eastern domination of the province, a hatred that grew out of unequal representation in the assembly and the assembly's failure to provide defense for the frontiers. The Conestoga Massacre projected the Paxton Boys into one of the bitterest political campaigns in the history of Pennsylvania (1764). Numerous pamphlets were written (one by Franklin) and in January, 1764, 600 armed "back inhabitants" marched on Philadelphia, intent on destroying their political opponents Franklin was chiefly responsible for quelling this rebellion.

Lazarus Stewart, as head of the Paxton Boys, disgusted with the proprietary government and with writs hanging over him, moved with his followers to the Wyoming Valley in 1769, was granted a township by the Susquehanna Company of Connecticut, engaged in the Pennamite Wars that followed, and was killed in the Wyoming Massacre of 1778^{qq}.

[Francis Parkman, *Conspiracy of Pontiac*; B. J. Wallace, *Insurrection of the Paxton Boys*.]

JULIAN P. BOYD

Payne-Aldrich Tariff (1909). Bowing to public conviction that protection was fostering monopolies^{qq}, the Republican platform in 1908 promised tariff revision, offering the equalization of cost formula as the solution of the tariff^{qq} problem. But no painstaking study of costs was made and Congress generally accepted the testimony of petitioning firms. Although the House increased some rates, it attempted downward revision and put coal, iron ore and hides on the free list. But in the Senate, under the leadership of Nelson W. Aldrich, an extreme protectionist, duties were voted on iron ore, hides and coal, while scores of increases were made. In conference Taft brought pressure for lower rates and forced hides on the free list. The tariff, however, remained distinctly protective and led to the decisive defeat of the Republicans in the congressional elections of 1910. (*See also* Tariff Board.)

[F. W. Taussig, *The Tariff History of the United States*.]

FRANK A. SOUTHARD, JR.

Payne's Landing, Treaty of, was made on the Ocklawaha River, Florida, May 9, 1832, by James Gadsden for the United States, with fifteen Seminole chiefs, providing for a delegation of Indians to proceed to the West and decide whether land set apart for them there was acceptable. If so, the Seminoles^{qq} were to remove within the next three years, giving up all their Florida lands and receiving an equal amount in the West in addition

to certain money compensations. Disputes over this treaty and other problems led to the second Seminole War⁷⁰.

[Grant Foreman, *Indian Removal*; J. B. McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*, Vol. VI; C. J. Kappler, ed., *Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties*, Vol. II; J. R. Giddings, *The Exiles of Florida*.]

E. MERTON COULTER

Pea Ridge (Elkhorn), Battle of (March 7-8, 1862). In the struggle for control of the trans-Mississippi, a Confederate Army under Van Dorn maneuvered against a Union Army under Curtis, of about equal strength. They met in northwestern Arkansas. A fierce two-day fight ensued with alternating success for each side. In the first day's fighting, at a critical moment, two of the Confederate leaders were killed. Superior leadership and equipment finally brought victory to the Union Army. This battle ended organized fighting in the trans-Mississippi. All troops were soon transferred to the line of the Mississippi (*see* Mississippi, Opening of the).

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Peabody Fund. This, the pioneer educational foundation in the United States, was established in 1867 by George Peabody, a native of Massachusetts who subsequently became a banker in London. His first gift was \$1,000,000 to which two years later he added a like sum to encourage and assist educational effort in "those portions of our beloved and common country which have suffered from the destructive ravages, and not less disastrous consequences, of civil war." When he made his second gift, Mr. Peabody said to the trustees of the fund: "This I give to the suffering South for the good of the whole country." To administer the fund he named sixteen Northern and Southern men of prominence and distinction, who selected Dr. Barnas Sears, president of Brown University, as the first general agent of the fund. Upon his death in 1880 he was succeeded by Dr. J. L. M. Curry, president of Howard College in Alabama, who was succeeded by Dr. Wyckliffe Rose, of Tennessee, as general agent. Through the tactful and energetic work of these agents the fund greatly assisted general education and teacher training for both whites and Negroes in the states that had formed the Southern Confederacy⁷¹, and in West Virginia, and proved to be a most wholesome influence during the dark days that followed the war. When the fund was dissolved in 1914 the bulk of the capital went to the endowment of The George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.; some went to Southern universities for

schools of education; and some to the John F. Slater Fund. During its life the Peabody Fund distributed from income about \$3,650,000.

[Edgar W. Knight, *Public School Education in North Carolina*; *Proceedings of the Peabody Board of Trustees*.]

EDGAR W. KNIGHT

Peace has been generally a policy of the United States, whenever peace has been in accord with the vital interests of the nation. Where it has clashed with those interests (as in the case of the wars with Mexico and with Spain) the United States has gone to war to further them: in the one instance, to expand its territory through to the Pacific Ocean after Mexico conveniently refused a peaceful settlement of the Texas boundary and actually declared war; in the other case, to secure strategic control of the Caribbean and the approaches to the vitally important Isthmian canal. In two other foreign wars the United States has preferred to go to war for the defense of the freedom of the seas⁷² when that was ruthlessly challenged by both sets of belligerents in a world war, but in each case it chose as an enemy the belligerent against whom war would best serve its vital interests. In 1812 war with Great Britain instead of France offered prospect of the conquest of Canada⁷³ from the enemy, and of Florida from the enemy's ally, Spain. In 1917 war with Germany meant crushing an arbitrary power which might in the future, if victorious, unite with another arbitrary power across the other ocean to menace the New World and its ideology. However one may question the success of these wars, the fact is that the people supported them because peace seemed no longer to the national interest—the enemies would have preferred, in each of these foreign wars, that the United States remain at peace.

Peace instead of civil war in 1861 would have meant the split-up of the Union and the South Americanizing of North America into many nations. War maintained the Union and the nation, which nation war itself had created in 1776-83.

Today, because of the fruits of these wars, the people clamor for peace, since peace is to the interests of a satiated state, which has all it wants. Hence the United States has in general supported peace among nations.

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Peace Caravans. Many peace caravans were active in the decade 1930-40. The first was planned by Mabel Vernon in 1931, under the auspices of the United States section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Its purpose was to gather signatures to

a petition for international disarmament. Mabel Vernon and Katherine Devereux Blake started in a Ford car from Hollywood, Calif., followed a zigzag course toward Washington, and spoke at numerous disarmament rallies on the way. From city to city they were often escorted by local peace cars. Five caravans which had gathered signatures in Pennsylvania joined the long parade of cars to the national capital, where the petition was presented to President Hoover. Later, it was sent to the Disarmament Conference held in Geneva in 1932.

In 1937 the People's Mandate to End War, directed also by Mabel Vernon, sent a successful "flying caravan" of five women from the United States to Latin America to speed ratification of the Buenos Aires peace treaties. It was headed by Mrs. Burton W. Musser of Utah.

[*Records of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at Swarthmore College, and of the People's Mandate to End War, Washington, D. C.*]

MARY WILHELMINE WILLIAMS

Peace Commission of 1778 (British). The surrender of Gen. Burgoyne's army at Saratoga⁹⁰ on Oct. 17, 1777, inspired the British government to propose peace to the revolted colonies, an offer based on repeal of the obnoxious parliamentary legislation since 1763 and a constitutional arrangement of home rule within the empire. Following the necessary authorization from Parliament, the government sent to Philadelphia a commission headed by Lord Carlisle, and including William Eden and George Johnstone. It was really an effort to secure a reconciliation with the "colonies" before France should make an alliance with them. But Congress refused to hold parley with the commission, although the terms which it was ready to offer would have been satisfactory before the Declaration of Independence⁹¹. The arrival of the French treaties of Feb. 6, 1778, extinguished all hope of negotiation. The Carlisle peace mission seems to have been the first concrete suggestion of the idea of dominion self-government.

[Sir George O. Trevelyan, *American Revolution*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Peace Conference, THE (1919). *See* World War: Peace Conference (1919).

Peace Conference at Buenos Aires (1936). On Jan. 30, 1936, President Roosevelt wrote directly to the presidents of the Latin-American republics suggesting that a conference be convened at Buenos Aires to discuss the maintenance of peace in the Western Hemisphere by ratifying pending inter-American peace instruments, or by amend-

ing existing peace treaties, or by creating new peace agreements. The invitations were enthusiastically received and many program topics were suggested. These were finally formulated by the governing board of the Pan American Union⁹² into a program consisting of the following general headings: (1) organization of peace; (2) neutrality; (3) limitation of armaments; (4) juridical problems; (5) economic problems; (6) intellectual co-operation, or "moral disarmament."

The conference met at Buenos Aires Dec. 1-23, 1936, with Secretary of State Hull leading the United States delegation and with President Roosevelt delivering the opening address in person. The conference was presided over by Saavedra Lamas, the Argentine minister of foreign affairs. The delegates voted in favor of consulting together and co-operating to settle all threats to American peace from within and without through the use of conciliation and arbitration. The questions of organizing an American League of Nations and the establishment of an inter-American Court of Justice were postponed for consideration at the Eighth International American Conference at Lima⁹³, Peru, in December, 1938. In all, seventy acts were approved, including the exchange of students and teachers as a means of promoting moral disarmament.

[*Report on the Proceedings of the Conference submitted to the Governing Board of the Pan American Union by the Director General, Pan American Union, Washington, February, 1937.*]

A. CURTIS WILGUS

Peace Conferences, as herein considered, are those international public conferences at which principles and rules of international relations designed to assist in the settlement of international controversies without resort to war were the subject of discussion. Conferences to terminate wars, or to limit armaments, or to consider co-operative action—such as that of the Universal Postal Union—having a generally moderative influence, are excluded. So also are the conferences, national and international, of private organizations for peace.

The first American arbitration agreements, those in the Jay Treaty of 1794 with Great Britain and in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo⁹⁴ of 1848 with Mexico, may properly be regarded as the first steps of the United States in the provision of peace machinery by international conference. Jay's negotiations were ancillary to those of Paris, 1782-83 (*see* Definitive Treaty of Peace), while the latter treaty brought peace with Mexico. Not until 1889, however, did the United States participate in peace conferences of the type now under consideration with European states.

Each of the Pan-American conferences⁷⁷ has given attention to the problem of peaceful settlement. Secretary Blaine first invited the independent American states to a conference in 1882 to consider "methods of preventing war between the nations of America." War between Chile and Peru prevented the holding of the conference. Seven years later the first of eight conferences was convened at Washington under the presidency of Secretary Blaine. A treaty of arbitration was signed by eleven (including the United States) out of seventeen states. It declared that arbitration⁷⁸ was a principle of American international law⁷⁹, compulsory in all issues not involving state independence. Failure of all but one state (Brazil) to ratify caused this treaty to be dropped. At the second conference, 1901-2, an obligatory pecuniary claims convention was drawn up, to be later ratified by the United States. The third conference, 1906, extended the claims convention and recommended to the forthcoming Second Hague Conference the subject of peaceful procedure for the collection of public debts. The fourth conference, 1910, extended indefinitely the pecuniary claims convention. At the fifth conference, 1923, the United States consented to an elective chairmanship of the governing board of the Pan American Union but opposed any specific interpretation or joint sanction of the Monroe Doctrine⁸⁰. Especially notable was the acceptance of the so-called Gondra Treaty, modeled upon the Bryan peace plan⁸¹, establishing the principle and machinery of inquiry into all disputes other than those covered by constitutional or treaty provisions. The sixth conference, 1928, at which criticisms of interventionism were vigorously voiced, resolved that a special arbitration and conciliation conference should be held at Washington in 1929. The product of that conference was a General Treaty of Inter-American Arbitration, ratified by the United States in 1935, and a General Convention of Inter-American Conciliation which added conciliatory functions to those of the commissions of inquiry created under the Gondra Treaty, ratified in 1929. In 1933 the seventh conference, which was held after the signature of the Argentine Anti-War Treaty on Non-Aggression and Conciliation—an amplification of the Pact of Paris—passed a resolution characterizing good offices and mediation as friendly procedures, and a protocol implementing the conciliation convention of 1929. An interim "Conference for the Maintenance of Peace" at Buenos Aires, 1936, was called at President F. D. Roosevelt's suggestion. The President visited the conference and the friendly attitude of Latin-American delegates indicated confidence in the

"Good Neighbor" policy⁸². The conventions adopted filled important gaps in the already considerable structure of inter-American peace law. Most significant in relation to contemporary fear of interference from fascist states was the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Re-establishment of Peace, or Consultative Pact, providing for consultation toward "peaceful collaboration" in the event of war between American states or "outside America." Other acts of the conference were a Treaty on the Prevention of Controversies, a second Treaty on Good Offices and Mediation, and a Convention on Treaty Coordination and Neutrality. Together with a Declaration on Inter-American Solidarity, these agreements appeared to move toward "continentalizing" the Monroe Doctrine.

The United States has participated in two conferences with the Central-American states in which peace planning was an objective. At the first conference, in 1907, the role of the United States was wholly one of assistance toward the framing of conventions between the five small republics. In the second conference, in 1923, United States delegates were members but signed only the Convention for the Establishment of International Commissions of Inquiry and the protocol providing for appointment of United States citizens to the panel of the Central-American Tribunal.

The record of participation by the United States in peace conferences outside Pan-America is less impressive. In 1899 and 1907 American delegations to the Hague Peace Conferences⁸³ took an effective part in the creation of the Permanent Court of Arbitration⁸⁴ and in the elaboration of the Convention for the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes. At both conferences, but particularly in 1907, the Americans urged the necessity of a judicial tribunal. This effort was continued through the membership of Elihu Root on the commission of jurists which, in 1920, drew up the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice⁸⁵.

President Wilson and his American colleagues at the Conference of Paris (*see* World War: Peace Conference) played a distinguished part in the drafting of the Covenant of the League of Nations⁸⁶. In 1921-22 at the Washington Conference the United States, by signing the Nine-Power Treaty concerning China, and the Four-Power Pact⁸⁷ on insular territories in the Pacific, bound itself to communicate or consult with the other signatories in specified contingencies. The Treaty for the Renunciation of War (termed the Pact of Paris or the Kellogg Pact⁸⁸), 1928, was not drawn up in conference but through diplo-

matic interchanges in which the ideas of Secretary Kellogg, Senator Borah and a number of private American citizens, notably S. O. Levinson and James T. Shotwell, were embodied. According to Mr. Kellogg the obligation to consult in the event of threat of hostilities is "inherent" in the treaty. In 1930 at the London Naval Conference⁷⁰ the American delegation was prepared to enter into a consultative pact but its opposition to any accompanying guarantee of security prevented agreement on that point. On May 22, 1933, encouraged by planks favorable to consultative undertakings in the Republican and Democratic platforms of 1932, Norman Davis stated to the Geneva Conference for Reduction of Armaments that, conditioned upon a treaty reducing armaments, the United States "was willing to consult with other States in case of a threat to peace . . . [and to] refrain [if it concurred with them] from any action tending to defeat . . . collective effort . . . to restore peace."

[Graham H. Stuart, *Latin America and the United States*; Philip C. Jessup, *The United States and the Stabilization of Peace*.]

HAROLD S. QUIGLEY

Peace Convention, Washington (1861). See Border Slave State Convention, The.

Peace Democrats. See Copperheads.

Peace Movement in 1864. Efforts to end the Civil War in 1864 commenced in July with negotiations between Horace Greeley of the *New York Tribune* and Confederate commissioners J. P. Holcombe, C. C. Clay and Jacob Thompson at Niagara Falls, Canada. Lincoln's terms, presented by Greeley, were reunion and emancipation. A meeting with the commissioners by Greeley and John Hay, Lincoln's secretary, showed the impossibility of an agreement. In August an equally futile visit was made by Jeremiah Black, friend of Thompson and Secretary of War Stanton, whom he claimed to represent. In Richmond, J. F. Jaquess and J. R. Gilmore, with Lincoln's permission, interviewed President Davis in July, without result.

Lincoln's message to Congress in December stipulated a cessation of resistance to the Union as the only peace basis. Visits to Davis by F. P. Blair, Sr., in January, 1865, led to the abortive Hampton Roads Conference⁷¹ on Feb. 3. Thus ended hope for a negotiated peace.

[E. C. Kirkland, *The Peacemakers of 1864*.]

CHARLES H. COLEMAN

Peace Movements. Although individual Americans had criticized war and even tried to prevent its declaration, it was not until August, 1815, that David Low Dodge, a well-to-do New York merchant, organized what was probably the first

peace society in the world. Four months later the Rev. Noah Worcester and the Rev. William Ellery Channing established in Boston the Massachusetts Peace Society. Similar local societies were formed in the following years from Maine to Georgia and as far west as Ohio. In 1828 these scattered societies were united in the American Peace Society⁷². The first American peace societies entered into correspondence with the London Peace Society (1816), and with similar groups in Paris and Geneva formed a few years later. The establishment of these peace societies was in part the result of a reaction against the War of 1812 and the wars of Napoleon, and in part an expression of the growing determination of religious-minded humanitarians to endeavor, through popular organizations, to influence public opinion and governments to take action against institutions and customs regarded as contrary to Christian ethics and the ideal of human brotherhood.

The early peace societies established periodicals and published tracts designed to convince mankind that war was unchristian, wasteful of life and treasure, and an ineffective method of solving disputes between nations. The criticisms of war that had earlier been made by Erasmus, Grotius, Kant, Rousseau, Turgot, Penn, Franklin and Jefferson were made available in popular form. In addition to the religious, humanitarian and economic attack on war, the peace societies tried to popularize specific proposals for the prevention of war. Such writers as Pierre Dubois, Eméric Crucé, William Penn and the Abbé de Saint-Pierre had advocated permanent arbitration tribunals and federations of nations, and the Holy Alliance of Alexander I seemed to be an indication that these ideas were at last practicable. American friends of peace contributed to the refinement of the traditional schemes for world organization in the interest of peace. Noah Worcester advocated (*A Solemn Review of the Custom of War*, 1814) a permanent court of arbitration and a congress of nations for effecting the mutual reduction of standing armies and navies, and for the negotiation of solemn contracts that "in the future no armed force by sea or land shall be employed by one nation for the annoyance of another." William Ladd's *Essay on a Congress of Nations*⁷³ (1840) was the high-water mark in the discussions of international organization during the first half of the 19th century. The early American peace movement also favored the plan of William Jay for "stipulated arbitration" (1842). This proposed permanent treaties pledging signatories to submit all future disputes to arbitration⁷⁴.

At the instance of William Ladd, founder of the American Peace Society (1828), petitions to the Massachusetts legislature led (1833 and 1835) to the first legislative action in the United States, and probably in the world, distinctly favorable to the idea of a congress of nations. In 1837 the New York Peace Society carried the same subject to the Federal Government. After continued efforts, centering in successive petitions and in lobbying, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations reported favorably (1851 and 1853) on the proposal for the insertion of compulsory arbitration clauses in treaties with foreign governments.

The American Peace Society, for which William Ladd made heroic sacrifices, did not continue to enjoy inner harmony after his death in 1841. Peace advocates had long differed on the question of defensive war, some maintaining that the Scriptures forbade all war, including wars of defense, and others maintaining that defensive wars were permitted by Scriptures, by reason, and by nature herself. The doctrinaire nonresistants, William Lloyd Garrison, Henry C. Wright, Adin Ballou and others, unable to commit the American Peace Society to a condemnation of all war whatsoever, formed (1838) the New England Non-Resistance Society. This organization, which accepted Garrison's conviction that it was unrighteous to co-operate with a government based on force and on such evils as slaveholding, maintained a separate existence for more than a decade.

Dissatisfied with the moderate policy of George C. Beckwith, who dominated the American Peace Society after the death of Ladd, a group of pacifists believing in more militant methods of propaganda, as well as in the condemnation of all war, formed in 1846 the League of Universal Brotherhood. This organization, which was international in scope and which included many reforms related to peace, was largely the creation of Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith." Its members, numbering within a few years 20,000 Americans and 20,000 Britishers, took an ironclad pledge never to support, in any way, any war whatsoever, for whatever purpose. The League of Universal Brotherhood sponsored ocean penny postage, for which Burritt made remarkable campaigns in both England and the United States, "assisted emigration" from Europe to America, the free labor production of cotton, a workingman's strike against an impending war, and the interchange of "friendly addresses" between the peoples of different countries. Under Burritt's direction the League of Universal Brotherhood also succeeded in having inserted in forty European newspapers

peace propaganda in the form of unlabeled paid copy.

In addition to these manifold activities, Burritt was in considerable part responsible for the successful "universal peace congresses" which met in various European and British cities between 1848 and 1853. These congresses, to which many Americans came, were widely publicized and probably mark the greatest achievement of European and American peace advocates in the first half of the 19th century. In 1856 Burritt returned to the United States and inaugurated a new movement designed to prevent civil war. Through a periodical, lecture tours in the North, South and West, and a national convention, he endeavored to persuade the public and Congress to provide for the compensated emancipation⁷⁰ of slaves from a fund to be derived from the sale of Federal lands.

Although some organized friends of peace looked with favor on the efforts made on the eve of the Civil War to effect another compromise between the North and South, the greater number opposed any concessions to the "slavocracy." With few exceptions, those who had labored against war accepted the Civil War on the ground that it was not a genuine war but a rebellion against constituted authority. Burritt and a few others, however, remained consistently in opposition to the war; this was also true of most Quakers⁷¹ and members of other nonresistant sects. Burritt and a handful of pacifists⁷² endeavored to persuade Sumner, who had been the chief political representative of the old peace movement, to lead an end-the-war movement. In general, however, former peace men frowned on such proposals and ignored the later efforts of Horace Greeley to end the war by unofficial negotiations with Confederate representatives (*see* Peace Movement in 1864). As the war continued, defeatist movements, such as the Knights of the Golden Circle⁷³ and, in the Confederacy, "the Peace Society," gained considerable support. These defeatist movements were mainly inspired by war weariness and by opposition to the war leaders and to the objectives of the war, rather than by pacifism itself.

After the surrender of Lee, the American Peace Society, which had continued during the war to maintain limited activities, extended its operations into the West. No important departures were made from the old program and methods of propaganda. Harassed by financial difficulties, the American Peace Society made slight headway. The Rev. James Miles, who served for a time as its secretary, endeavored both in the United States and in Europe to popularize the idea of

the codification of international law⁷⁷, an enterprise in which the New York jurist, David Dudley Field, was interested. In 1873 an organization devoted to this purpose was formed. Subsequently taking the name of the International Law Association, this organization brought an increasing number of publicists and students of international law into relations with the peace societies.

Discontented with the compromising record of the American Peace Society during the Civil War, a group of extreme pacifists organized, in 1866, the Universal Peace Union. This organization, which claimed a membership of 10,000, was guided and kept together by Alfred Love, a Philadelphia commission merchant. The Universal Peace Union repudiated the use of all violence in every human relationship, emphasized the value of peace symbols and slogans, and extended the practice of sending petitions and delegations to Washington in behalf of measures for the arbitration of controversies and the reduction of armaments. Unlike most of the earlier peace movements, the Universal Peace Union held out a fraternal hand to labor and tried to extend the principle of arbitration to conflicts between capital and labor.

With the revival of the earlier series of "universal peace congresses" in 1890, both the Universal Peace Union and the American Peace Society were again closely associated with European antiwar movements. In 1893 the Universal Peace Congress met in Chicago, and in 1904 in Boston. The organized friends of peace concentrated their efforts on a program of arbitration treaties. The Lake Mohonk Arbitration Conferences, inaugurated in 1895 by Albert Smiley, brought many prominent figures into the movement for international arbitration. The growing tendency of the Government to negotiate arbitration treaties was in part the result of the pressure of the peace movement. In times of international tension, notably during the Venezuela affair⁷⁸ of 1895, the forces of peace gave evidence of remarkable activity.

With the growth of navalism and imperialism after the Spanish-American War, which friends of peace endeavored to prevent, the movement against war made rapid headway. The venerable American Peace Society, under the able leadership of Dr. Benjamin Trueblood, enjoyed a great expansion; and new peace organizations were established. Of the sixty-three organizations devoted to the cause of peace on the eve of the World War, some of the most impressive were the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, devoted to the organization of a truly judicial international court at

The Hague, the American School Peace League, the Church Peace Union, the World Peace Foundation, endowed by Edward Ginn, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace⁷⁹. Great national peace congresses were attended by outstanding educators, leading clergymen, prominent businessmen, and high government officials. Under the leadership of Richard Bartholdt a "peace bloc" was formed in Congress.

The outbreak of the World War destroyed the optimistic hope of many that world peace was not far in the future. The newly organized League to Enforce Peace undertook to interest the public and the Government in a projected League of Nations. Others, particularly the leaders in the Ford Peace Ship⁸⁰ enterprise, tried to bring about neutral mediation in order to end the war, and, when this failed, to determine and publicize the aims of the belligerents. In the months preceding American entrance into the war, many established peace groups, and newly formed ones, courageously tried to persuade the executive and Congress to persist in the policy of neutrality⁸¹ and peace. During American participation in the war, the popular, unofficial peace movement virtually collapsed. Although some leaders remained loyal to their pacifist convictions, the chief opposition to the war came from such left-wing radical groups as the I. W. W. and the Socialists⁸².

With the return of peace and the Senate's rejection of the League of Nations⁸³, new groups, such as the League of Nations Association, were organized to work for American participation in the League and the World Court. Many women shared the conviction of Jane Addams that the struggle for peace must be accompanied by a struggle for freedom and justice, and that this struggle must repudiate the technique of violence under all circumstances; this was the basic philosophy of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Conscientious objectors⁸⁴ to every possible war formed the Fellowship for Reconciliation. To give some unity to the efforts in behalf of peace the National Council for the Prevention of War was organized in 1921. This organization conducted a vigorous propaganda and, with the Women's International League, fought bills for the increase of appropriations for the armed services. The Committee on Militarism in Education opposed the compulsory service of college men in R.O.T.C.⁸⁵ units. With the rise of fascism, and its aggressive foreign policy, the League Against War and Fascism called attention to the connection between war and fascism. This group, together with advocates of collective security in the more conservative peace organizations, was sharply op-

posed by the majority of peace societies which were in part responsible for the enactment of the neutrality legislation of 1936. Although the period following the World War saw a great extension in organized peace activities, it did not witness the acceptance of a common program for preventing war.

[Merle Curti, *Peace or War, the American Struggle against War, 1636-1936*; Devere Allen, *The Fight for Peace*; Elton Atwater, *Organized Efforts in the United States toward Peace*; James Wechsler, *War in the Peace Movement*, in *The Nation*, March 19, 26, 1938]

MERLE CURTI

Peace Resolutions of British Parliament to End the American Revolution (1782). Although Great Britain had suffered some disastrous defeats in America, culminating in Cornwallis' surrender (see Yorktown Campaign, 1781), she was by no means crushed; it was the triumph of the liberal parliamentary opposition that made possible negotiations for peace. The historic resolution, introduced on Feb. 22 by Gen. Conway, finally passed the House of Commons by a majority of nineteen votes on Feb. 28, 1782. The resolution prayed His Majesty that the war in America might no longer be pursued for the impracticable purpose of reducing the inhabitants of that country to obedience by force. On March 4 Conway carried unanimously another motion "that the house will consider as enemies of the King and country all who shall advise, or by any means attempt, the further prosecution of offensive war for the purpose of reducing the revolted colonies to obedience by force."

[George Otto Trevelyan, *George the Third and Charles Fox*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

"Peace without Victory." In his address to the Senate on Jan. 22, 1917, President Wilson attempted to state the terms of peace which in his opinion would create "a stable Europe." The peace, he said, "must be a peace without victory. . . . Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed on the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress. . . . Only a peace between equals can last. . . . The right state of mind, the right feeling between nations, is as necessary for a lasting peace as is the just settlement of vexed questions of territory or racial and national allegiance." At that moment Wilson was still hoping to mediate between the European powers at war, and was not expecting the rupture with Germany which came in less than two weeks.

[R. S. Baker and W. E. Dodd, eds., *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson; Foreign Relations of the United States, 1917, supplement I, The World War*.]

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT

Peacock-Epervier Engagement

Peachtree Creek, Battles on (1864). As the Confederate Army fell back on Atlanta (see Atlanta Campaign), the Richmond government (C) became impatient and alarmed. J. E. Johnston was replaced by Hood because he had failed to arrest Sherman's (U.) advance (see Davis-Johnston Controversy).

On the night of July 19, 1864, the Union Army began crossing Peachtree Creek to start a vigorous movement against the Atlanta defenses. Hood adopted Johnston's plan, already formulated, to attack the Union Army as it crossed.

The Confederate movement was delayed until late afternoon of July 20 and then was only partially successful. Poor staff work and confusion in orders and judgment resulted in unco-ordinated attacks. Sherman's center already across Peachtree Creek could not be dislodged. Darkness ended the fighting. The 21st was passed in artillery bombardments, isolated actions and maneuvering for position.

During the night Hood learned that Sherman's left under McPherson, moving to cut the Confederate communications into Atlanta, was exposed and vulnerable. Late at night Hardee (C) was ordered to withdraw his command and march to attack McPherson. As soon as McPherson could be forced back the remainder of the Confederate Army would move forward. Because of the distances involved, Hardee could not attack until about noon. McPherson was taken by surprise and only saved from defeat by the fortuitous arrival of Blair's 16th Corps. The remainder of Hood's army did not attack until nearly four hours after Hardee had moved forward. Sherman was able to reinforce McPherson and halt Hardee. McPherson was killed. Night closed with Hardee in possession of the field. The losses on both sides had been heavy in this the bloodiest fight of the Atlanta Campaign.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, IV.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Peacock-Epervier Engagement (April 29, 1814). The new American sloop *Peacock*, 18 guns, Master-Commandant Lewis Warrington, captured the British brig *Epervier*, 18 guns, Capt. Wales, off Cape Canaveral, Fla. The *Peacock*, slightly superior in all respects, lost the use of her foresails at the outset, but drove forty-five shots into her opponent's hull and killed eight, and wounded fifteen, of the crew. The American loss was two wounded. The prize was brought safely into Savannah.

[A. T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812*.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Pearl Case, THE (1848). Shortly after the suppression in 1848 of the Underground Railroad^{as} for fugitive slaves going north from Washington, the "underground station" in Washington, probably embarrassed by accumulating fugitives, sent seventy-seven of them down the Potomac on the schooner *Pearl*. There they were apprehended and brought back to Washington. Abolitionists^{as} made the case a national issue. The trial of their white "conductors," Drayton and Sayres, was published throughout the North, and in Congress, antislavery members, led by Joshua Giddings, provoked a three-day debate "worth thousands to the cause."

[M. C. McDougall, *Fugitive Slaves*; H. H. Caterall, *Judicial Cases concerning American Slavery and the Negro*.]
GILBERT HOBBS BARNES

Pearl Harbor Naval Base, on the south coast of Oahu, Hawaiian Islands, six miles west of Honolulu, is large enough to accommodate nearly the entire United States Fleet^{as}. In 1845 Lt. I. W. Curtis, an American marine officer, called attention to the harbor's vast importance for the Islands' defense, and in 1873 an American military commission reported favorably on Pearl Harbor as a port of refuge in wartime and pointed out its ease of defense. The Hawaiian government in 1887 granted the United States exclusive use of Pearl Harbor, and the right to maintain coaling and repair stations there. In 1908 the Navy Department dredged an entrance channel 600 feet wide and in 1926 deepened and widened this channel. A huge drydock was completed in July, 1919. In April, 1922, our Government awarded a contract to the Pan American Petroleum and Transport Company, headed by E. L. Doheny, for the construction and filling with fuel oil at Pearl Harbor of storage for 1,500,000 barrels, to be paid for with oil from the Navy's petroleum reserves^{as} in California. Though the Government subsequently declared this contract illegal, the oil tanks were completed in 1925. In addition, a marine railway, fueling stations, ammunition depots, machine shops, radio towers, a hospital, and a flying base on Ford Island have been built. Approximately \$50,000,000 has been spent on this naval station.

[W. F. Dillingham, Pearl Harbor, in *United States Naval Institute Proceedings*, May, 1930; J. K. Goodrich, *The Coming Hawaii*; *Report of the Secretary of the Navy*, 1922.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Pearl River figures in the maneuvers by which Americans seized West Florida^{as} from Spain. After the West Florida rebellion (1810) Spain unsuccessfully attempted to make Pearl River the eastern limit of American territorial aggression.

Congress in 1812 attached West Florida, from the Mississippi to the Pearl, to Louisiana, the area east of the Pearl to Mobile being attached to Mississippi Territory.

[Peter J. Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*.]

MACK SWEARINGEN

Peary's Polar Expeditions (1891-1909). Robert Edwin Peary, U. S. N., was sent in 1891 by the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences to explore northern Greenland wintering at McCormick Bay near latitude 78° he started April 30, 1892, with Eivind Astrup, and crossed the ice cap to Independence Bay on the northeastern coast of the island. The following year he returned to Greenland in the *Falcon*, and after spending two winters at Bowdoin Bay repeated the feat in 1895, with H. J. Lee and Matthew Henson.

In 1898 The Peary Arctic Club was organized in New York to finance an expedition under Peary to discover the North Pole. He sailed that year in the *Windward*, wintered at Cape d'Urville and spent the following year exploring Ellesmere Land and Grinnell Land. Proceeding along the Greenland coast in 1900 he reached Cape Morris K. Jesup in Hazen Land where he struck northward over the ice to latitude 83° 52'. Here he was forced back, but continued eastward along the coast to Wyckoff Island. Two years later he made another attempt, starting this time from Cape Hecla in Grant Land, only to be stopped by snow in latitude 84° 17'.

The Peary Arctic Club was still willing to back him, and in 1905 sent him out in the specially constructed *Roosevelt* to make another attempt. He wintered at Cape Sheridan, and the following year started northward from Point Moss with Capt. Robert A. Bartlett, equipped with dogs and sledges. In six weeks he reached latitude 87° 6' when open water forced him to turn back. Later in the season he led an expedition westward along the coast to Cape Thomas Hubbard, the northern extremity of Axel Heiberg Land.

Elated at his success the Club again sent him out in the *Roosevelt* in 1908. Wintering once more at Cape Sheridan he gathered a large party at Cape Columbia the following February, which he divided into detachments that were to precede him, establish caches and return. At latitude 87° 47' he parted from Capt. Bartlett and proceeded with only Henson and four Eskimos. On April 6, 1909, he reached the North Pole. Widely acclaimed as the discoverer of the Pole, Peary in 1911 was given the rank of Rear Admiral by Congress.

[Eivind Astrup, *With Peary near the Pole*; Josephine Diebitsch Peary, *My Arctic Journal*, containing Peary's

An Account of the Great White Journey across Greenland; Fitzhugh Green, *Peary, the Man Who Refused to Fail*; Robert E. Peary, *Northward over the Great Ice, Nearest the Pole*, and *The North Pole*.] N. M. CROUSE

Peck, Fort (Mont.), was built in 1867 for the trading firm of Durfee and Peck about two and a half miles above the Big Dry on the north side of the Missouri River. Durfee and Peck owned a number of steamboats and carried goods and equipment to soldiers and Indians. The fort had a stockade of logs, and a staff of fifteen to twenty men. In 1874 the owners sold the post to the Government, which maintained it as an Indian agency until 1879, when it was abandoned.

[P. C. Phillips, Professor of History, Univ. of Mont., Letter, April 13, 1938.] CARL L. CANNON

Peck, Fort, Dam is the largest of four huge check valves across the Missouri River intended so to regulate the flow of water as to assist in the prevention of floods, to lessen erosion and to supply additional water when needed to aid navigation between Sioux City and the Mississippi, a distance of 768 miles, by furnishing a constant nine-foot depth in the Missouri between these points. The dam is so arranged that whenever there is sufficient demand for hydroelectric power in northeastern Montana dynamos may be put into operation.

The dam is an earth fill, faced with rubble, forming a reservoir of 245,000 acres capable of impounding 20,000,000 acre-feet of water in a lake 180 miles long. The crest length is 9000 feet, its height is 273 feet. Built by the Government, the cost was estimated to be \$84,000,000, and its construction gave employment to 7000 men (1934-38).

The name of this enormous work, said to be the largest of its kind, is derived from its location near the old Fort Peck Indian Agency at the confluence of the Milk and Missouri rivers. Here the army has built a modern town, complete with recreation halls, churches, schools, etc., to provide for the workmen and their families.

[*Scientific American*, 154:306-9, June, 1936.]

ROBERT G. RAYMER

Pecos, a town in New Mexico, about thirty miles southeast of Santa Fé, was known as Cicuye to the first Spaniards who, under Coronado^o, reached the place in 1540. Pecos was then, and long after, the largest and most populous settlement of the Pueblo Indians^o in New Mexico. After the conversion of the natives to Christianity, their town was a flourishing mission with church, school and friary, especially during the 18th century, though it suffered repeatedly from

epidemics and Comanche^o raids. The town was abandoned in 1838. Today the ruins of the massive church testify to former progress and prosperity.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*; A. F. Bandelier, *Report on the Ruins of the Pueblo of Pecos*]

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK

Pecos Trail, THE. See Goodnight Loving Trail.

Peculiar Institution was an euphemistic term which Southerners used as a pseudonym for slavery^o. John C. Calhoun defended the "peculiar labor" of the South in 1828 and the "peculiar domestick institution" in 1830. The term came into general use in the 1830's when the Garrisonian abolitionists^o began to attack slavery.

[Augustin Cochin, *The Results of Slavery*; A. B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition*; Gaillard Hunt, *John C. Calhoun*; U. B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South*.]

FLETCHER M. GREEN

Peddlers. As soon as the settlements in America were sufficiently advanced to produce surpluses, and to demand the surplus commodities of each other, these commodities were transported by pack on back, by horse, by boat or by carriage. Clocks and tinware are outstanding examples of commodities distributed by the colonial peddler (see Yankee Notions). At times the peddler provided the back settlements with their only contacts with the rest of the world, and at times he was guilty of gross deception in selling his wares. With improvements in transportation and communication, peddling as formerly understood declined in importance, although there were 16,594 people in the United States who followed the occupation in 1860: In more recent times the peddler has been referred to as a door-to-door salesman.

[Richardson Wright, *Hawkers and Walkers in Early America*.]

FRED M. JONES

Peggy Stewart, Burning of the. "I would not be surprised to hear that you made a Bon Fire of the Peggy Stewart as I have a hint that a certain T[homas] W[illiams] has ship'd Tea on Board of her." So wrote J. J. Johnson, London representative of the Annapolis firm of Wallace, Davidson and Johnson on Aug. 4, 1774. The ship reached Annapolis on Oct. 14, 1774, with about a ton of tea^o consigned to Williams & Co. Williams paid the duty on the tea, but permission was not given to land it, even when Anthony Stewart, owner of the *Peggy Stewart*, and Williams offered to land it and destroy it. The threatening mob finally allowed Stewart to run the vessel aground on Windmill Point and burn

it to the water's edge. When dredging some years ago to enlarge the Naval Academy, the charred timbers of the old ship were found.

[Letter Book of Wallace, Davidson and Johnson, in Hall of Records, Annapolis, I, p. 447; The Burning of the *Peggy Stewart*, in *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. V; W. B. Norris, *Annapolis: Its Colonial and Naval History*.]

JAMES A. ROBERTSON

Pejepscot Purchase, THE, was a tract of land, indefinite in extent, on the Androscoggin River (Maine), purchased Nov. 5, 1714, from the estate of Richard Wharton, by a group of eight proprietors, Thomas Hutchinson, John Wentworth, Adam Winthrop, John Watts, David Jeffries, Stephen Minot, Oliver Noyes and John Ruck, most of them of Boston. The title rested on the New England Council^m grant of June 16, 1632, to Thomas Purchase and George Way, supplemented by Indian deeds. The proprietors, the first of their kind active in Maine, may be credited with the early settlement of Brunswick (1715) and Topsham, protected by Fort George, built partly at the proprietors' charge. The threat of Indian wars deflected interest from 1720 to 1737 after which the settlements grew rapidly. A dispute with the Kennebec proprietors who claimed the same land was settled by compromise in 1766. Other land disputes were settled by legislative action in 1814. With the final distribution of their lands soon after, the proprietors disbanded.

[G. A. and H. W. Wheeler, *History of Brunswick, Topsham and Harpswell, including the ancient territory known as Pejepscot*.]

ROBERT E. MOODY

Peking Congress, THE, met from October, 1900, until the following September to adjust and settle the political, social, economic and religious questions arising from the Boxer Rebellion^m. W. W. Rockhill, who had suggested the wording of the Open Door^m memorandum to Secretary of State John Hay, headed the American delegation. By the provisions of the protocol, adopted Sept. 7, 1901, China agreed to punish the officials responsible for the murder of foreigners, allowed the diplomatic corps the right to a fortified legation quarter in Peking, and agreed that alien troops might be maintained in China to protect the communication lines running from Peking to the sea. Against the desire of the Americans, China agreed, also, to pay an inflated indemnity of \$315,000,000, of which 7.3%, or \$23,000,000, was to be paid to the United States. In 1908, \$11,000,000 of the American share was returned to China. The sum thus remitted was devoted by the Chinese to an education fund.

[John V. A. MacMurray, *Treaties and Agreements with or concerning China*; Sir Edward Hertslet, *China Treaties; Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1901.]

HARRY EMERSON WILDES

Peking Tariff Conference, THE, was opened in October, 1925, as a result of China's appeal for restoration of her customs autonomy. The United States delegation, led by Silas Hardy Strawn of Chicago, urged tariff autonomy, provided Chinese *likin* (provincial taxes on goods in transit) were also abolished. Great Britain supported the proposal, but Japan opposed the plan. China asked also for abolition of extraterritoriality^m and for removal of foreign control over both the customs service and the salt-tax administration. Civil wars in China, together with antforeign agitation, forced a two months' recess of the conference, but, in March, 1926, the American proposals alone were accepted, effective January, 1929. The extraterritoriality problem was referred to a special conference for solution.

[Files of *New York Times*, *Japan Chronicle*, *The Times* of London, August, 1925-April, 1926; *Foreign Relations of the United States*, 1925-1926.]

HARRY EMERSON WILDES

Pemaquid, the peninsula on the Maine coast between the Kennebec region and Penobscot Bay, plays an important, if shadowy, role in the early history of American colonization. Pavements there, never satisfactorily explained, give weight to legends of very early occupation by Europeans (see Pemaquid Pavements). Mystery shrouds its beginnings, but it, with near-by Monhegan Island^m, was a center of European fisheries probably from the late 16th century on.

There was an Abenaki^m settlement there when Weymouth landed, June 3, 1605, at New Harbor. Rosier describes the peninsula. The English seized five Indians and took them home for exhibit. Men of the Popham plantation^m visited the place in 1607. In 1616 Capt John Smith found a dozen European fishing vessels there. Pemaquid was linked for many years with the colonial interests of Bristol, England; Robert Aldworth and Giles Elbridge, Bristol merchants, farmed its fisheries and furs. John Witheridge, a Devonian, was trading with the natives there in 1624. Englishmen were settled permanently at Pemaquid by 1625; and that year John Brown bought land from the great chief Samoset, whose "Welcome, Englishmen!" is like an invocation to American history. Abraham Shurt obtained a grant at Pemaquid in 1631-32 and built a palisaded post. The ship *Angel Gabriel* was wrecked at Pemaquid in 1631. Dixie Bull, the pirate, captured the place and got £500 worth of furs. It

was the most vital eastern outpost against the French colonization of Maine. Together with New York, New Jersey and Delaware, it was granted to the Duke of York in 1664, and was administered as a part of the "County of Cornwall" and the colony of New York under Andros. It was reclaimed by Massachusetts after the Duke of York became James II.

Pemaquid was a key position, heavily fortified, in the Indian wars. The early fort was taken by the Indians in 1676; the second, Fort Charles, in 1689; and Fort William Henry, built by Sir William Phips at a cost of £20,000, with walls six feet thick and twenty-two high, was captured by the French and Indians in 1696.

[H. O. Thayer, *Beginnings at Pemaquid, Maine Historical Society Collections*, Series II, 6; Henry S. Burrage, *The Beginnings of Colonial Maine*.]

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

Pemaquid Pavements, THE, were the unusually extensive stone remains of former constructions seen at Pemaquid^{ss}, Maine, until the middle of the 19th century, when most of them were taken up and used for local buildings. It was conjectured that these were remains of early fortifications, roadways, drying floors for fish, tannery pits, cellars or drainage systems. The discovery of a reddish stone native to Florida, called *coquina*, and coins and weapons of Spanish make, in excavations among these ruins, lent color to the theory that Pemaquid might have been occupied as a fishing base by the Spanish from St. Augustine^{ss} early in the 16th century.

[Henry Cartland, *Twenty Years at Pemaquid*; Arlita D. Parker, *A History of Pemaquid*.]

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

Pemaquid Proprietors, THE, were claimants to lands at Pemaquid as heirs of Nicholas Davison, who succeeded to the title held under the New England Council^{ss} grant of Feb. 29, 1631/2 to Robert Aldworth and Giles Elbridge of 12,000 acres of land plus 100 acres for each colonist. Shem Drowne of Boston, whose wife was one of the Davison heirs, organized the group in 1735, took possession in 1737, had a map made before 1741, and arranged three divisions of the lands in 1743 and 1744. The claim included all of the town of Bristol and parts of Newcastle and Nobleborough (Maine). Other claims (Brown, Tappan and Vaughan), based on Indian deeds, covered much of the same ground, and the land titles of the settlers were in such confusion that the Massachusetts legislature in 1811 appointed a commission to recommend a solution. In 1813 the claims under Indian deeds

were disallowed, but by agreement the Pemaquid Proprietors did not dispossess any settlers, accepting equivalents in wild lands elsewhere.

[John Johnston, *A History of the Towns of Bristol and Bremen in the State of Maine, including the Pemaquid Settlement*.]

ROBERT E. MOODY

Pembina, in North Dakota, at the junction of the Red and Pembina rivers, was a strategic fur-trade point for the North West Company in its war with the Hudson's Bay Company^{ss}. The Red River^{ss} Valley to the south of this point belonged by charter to the Hudson's Bay Company, but its rival early took possession of it, and its fur resources were exploited by the traders of the North West Company. Chaboillez, in 1797 (first trading post in the state), and Alexander Henry, Jr., in 1801, successively occupied the post for that company. It was also one of the best-known outfitting points for the buffalo hunters of the prairies to the west and south. Their Red River carts^{ss} and ponies returned with loads of pemmican^{ss}, robes, skins and dried meat. The pemmican was usually sold in Fort Garry or Winnipeg, where it was in great demand as a winter food. In 1819 the first permanent settlement in the state was made at Pembina, and here Rev. G. A. Belcourt built the first church in North Dakota. The Federal Government sent two expeditions from Fort Snelling^{ss} to Pembina, 1823 (*see* Long's Explorations), and 1849, for the purpose of locating the international boundary line of 1818.

[*Collections of the State Historical Society of N. Dak.*]

O. G. LIBBY

Pembroke Resolves, THE, were drawn up by the citizens of Pembroke, Mass., in 1772 in response to the plea of the Boston committee of correspondence^{ss} that the New England towns protest against the British ministry's plan of having the Massachusetts judges' salaries paid by the crown—a step which colonial patriots believed certain to create an arbitrary judiciary. The Pembroke men declared that British oppression called for the use of "every rightful art and energy of Policy, Stratagem, and Force." The Pembroke Resolves were given wide publicity in England by Solicitor General Wedderburn, who regarded them as proof of the alarming growth of American republicanism and sedition.

[J. C. Miller, *Sam Adams, Pioneer in Propaganda*.]

JOHN C. MILLER

Pemmican was the product of the Indian method of curing and preserving buffalo meat,

which later authorities maintain was equal to modern preserving methods. The meat was cut in thin strips and dried in the sun or the smoke of a wood fire until it was hard. It was then reduced to powder on a stone, and seasoned with wild cherry. Finally, an equal amount of buffalo marrow fat or tallow was added, and, while still soft, the mixture was shaken down in skin bags and sealed with tallow. Pemmican would keep indefinitely and could be eaten without cooking. The trappers borrowed the idea from the Indians and later passed it on to emigrants.

[H. M. Chittenden, *History of the Fur Trade in the Far West.*]

CARL L. CANNON

Pemmican War, THE. In August, 1812, the Hudson's Bay Company^o established an agricultural colony near Winnipeg, in the Red River Valley, the center of the pemmican^o-producing area. This concentrated food was vital to the rival North West Company^o, being the principal diet of the *voyageurs*^o. From Fort Daer (Pembina^o, N. Dak.), Miles McDonnell, governor of the Red River settlement, issued a proclamation, Jan. 8, 1814, forbidding the exportation from the colony of pemmican and other supplies. This brought on the Pemmican War between the two companies. Many acts of violence occurred on what is now United States soil. The British government finally intervened, and the two firms were merged in 1821.

[R. E. Pinkerton, *Hudson's Bay Company.*]

FRANK EDWARD ROSS

Pendleton Act, THE (Jan. 16, 1883), was written by Dorman B. Eaton, sponsored by Sen. George H. Pendleton of Ohio, and forced through Congress by public opinion. It exempted public officials from political assessments^o. A Civil Service Commission was established to prepare rules for a limited classified civil service^o which classified service the President could expand at discretion. Competitive examinations were to determine the qualifications of applicants while appointments were to be apportioned among the states according to population.

[C. R. Fish, *The Civil Service and the Patronage.*]

CHESTER MCA. DESTLER

Peninsular Campaign, THE. This advance against Richmond began on April 4, 1862, when Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan got his Union Army of 100,000 under way from Fortress Monroe, its base, to attack the Confederate capital by way of the peninsula formed by the York and James rivers. McClellan had counted on a larger force and on aid from the Navy on the James. Because his arrangements for the defense of

Washington were unsatisfactory to the administration, 45,000 troops were withheld from his command. The Navy was unable to help because of the menace of the *Merrimack*^o and Confederate shore batteries.

The campaign had three phases. The early Union advance was marked by Confederate resistance behind entrenchments across the peninsula from Yorktown. McClellan besieged Yorktown, which was evacuated on May 3. He then pushed slowly forward, fighting at Williamsburg on May 5, reaching and straddling the Chickahominy on May 20 and facing a strengthened Confederate force under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston.

Help expected from McDowell's 40,000 men was lost to McClellan in May when Jackson's Shenandoah Valley campaign^o scattered or immobilized the Union armies before Washington. The first phase of the campaign ended with the indecisive two-day battle of Fair Oaks^o or Seven Pines, May 31 and June 1. Johnston was wounded on June 1 and Robert E. Lee succeeded to his command.

After Fair Oaks came the second phase, three weeks without fighting, marked by Stuart's^o spectacular cavalry raid around the Union Army on June 11, 12 and 13.

McClellan, reinforced, intended to take the offensive again, but Lee forestalled him and opened the third phase of the campaign by attacking the Union right at Mechanicsville^o on June 26. This began the Seven Days Battle, during which McClellan changed his base to the James and retreated, fighting at Gaines' Mill on the 27th, at Allen's Farm and Savage's Station on the 29th, at Glendale on the 30th and at Malvern Hill^o on July 1. On the night of July 1 the Union Army withdrew to its base at Harrison's Landing and the unsuccessful Union campaign ended. With the appointment on July 11 of Gen. Henry W. Halleck to command all land forces of the United States, withdrawal of the Army of the Potomac^o from the peninsula began.

Union casualties in the campaign were 15,000, with 1700 killed; Confederate losses were 20,000, with 3200 killed. The Union forces greatly outnumbered the Confederate at the start of the campaign; toward its close the opposing forces were nearly equal.

[John Bach McMaster, *History of the People of the United States during Lincoln's Administration*; Alexander S. Webb, *The Peninsula: McClellan's Campaign of 1862; Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. II; John C. Ropes, *The Story of the Civil War*, Vol. II; Robert S. Henry, *The Story of the Confederacy.*]

EDWIN H. BLANCHARD

Penitent Brothers, *THE*, or *Los Hermanos Penitentes*, is a religious organization in New Mexico which traces its origin to the 16th century *conquistadores*⁹⁹ and through them to mediæval Europe. The local organizations are frequently incorporated as *cofradías* and are protected by law. The avowed purpose of the Penitentes is the celebration in actual dramatization of the passion of Jesus Christ as observed by mediæval Spanish Christians, thus preserving the concept of the expiation of sins through physical suffering. They have been driven to secrecy by the unpleasant notoriety given the flagellant exercises of Penitente Lenten ceremonies.

[Alice Corbin Henderson, *Brothers of Light*; Alexander M. Darley, *The Passionists of the Southwest*; Mary Austin, Trail of the Blood, in *The Century Magazine*, Vol. CVIII.]

DOROTHY WOODWARD

Pennamite and Yankee Wars. *See* Yankee-Pennamite Wars.

Penn's Creek Massacre (Oct. 16, 1755) ended the long period of peace between Brother Onas⁹⁹ and the aborigines. Braddock's defeat unloosed the fury of the Shawnees and Delawares⁹⁹, who, egged on by the French, attacked the settlements along (John) Penn's Creek, which meets the Susquehanna River at what is now Selinsgrove, Pa. Fifteen settlers were murdered, ten were taken captive, and only one escaped.

[C. Hale Sipe, *The Indian Chiefs of Pennsylvania*; William Schnure, Penn's Creek Massacre, in *Proceedings and Addresses of the Northumberland County Historical Society*, III.]

WILLIAM A. RUSS, JR.

Penn's Delaware Territories. *See* Delaware Counties. The Act of Union with Province of Pennsylvania; Lower Counties-on-Delaware.

Penn's Frame of Government, approved and signed in England by the first colonists and published by William Penn, April 25, 1682, consisted of twenty-four articles, to which was appended (May 5) the Laws Agreed upon in England—a bill of rights emphasizing religious liberty. Defining free government as one "where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws," Penn proceeded to establish a governor and council with large governing powers, including the sole power of originating laws, and an assembly with power limited to approval of laws promulgated by the council. Both bodies were to be elected by the freemen, one third of the council and the entire assembly to be chosen annually. The Charter of 1701, the joint work of Penn and the assembly, eliminated the coun-

cil and gave the assembly complete control over legislation and taxation. Another provision of this charter, by which the province was governed until 1776, led to the separation of Delaware from Pennsylvania.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, Vol. III.]

C. A. TITUS

Penn's Holy Experiment. *See* Holy Experiment.

Pennsylvania. Early in the 17th century the territory which is now Pennsylvania was disputed among the English, the Dutch and the Swedes. Henry Hudson's voyage in the *Half Moon*⁹⁹ established the Dutch claim; that of John Cabot and his "sea to sea" charter, the English claim; and both founded trading posts along the Delaware River (1623). The Swedes, under Peter Minuit (1638), built Fort Christina⁹⁹ and effected the beginnings of the first permanent settlement within the present boundaries of the state, with their capital at Upland (now Chester). The Dutch captured Fort Christina (1655) only to bow to the English with the fall of New Amsterdam in 1664. Until 1681 the prevailing government was known as the "Duke's Law" under the grant of Charles II to his brother, the Duke of York⁹⁹. (*See also* New Netherland; New Sweden, The Colony of.)

However, on March 4, 1681, William Penn, in return for a debt of £16,000 owed to his father by the crown, secured a grant to this territory for settlement by the persecuted English Quakers⁹⁹. As proprietor, he drew up his charter (1681) and his Frame of Government⁹⁹. Penn thus initiated his Holy Experiment, and his Charter of Privileges⁹⁹ (1701) was the established government until 1776. Disputes were so frequent between the proprietor's deputy governor and the assembly in the years following Penn's return to England (1702) that he threatened to return the grant to the crown (1712). His broken health prevented this action and, upon his death in 1718, the proprietorship descended to his sons, John, Richard and Thomas.

The peaceful, industrious Quakers, settling mainly in and about Philadelphia, prospered, and by 1730 there was an influx of oppressed German and Scotch-Irish⁹⁹ immigrants to Pennsylvania. Many Germans, under Pastorius, settled in Germantown⁹⁹, but the majority sought the farmlands near Reading and Lancaster, while the hardy Scotch-Irish moved on to the frontiers near Pittsburgh and southwestern Pennsylvania. Redemptioners⁹⁹ contributed great numbers to this later immigration.

Pennsylvania's boundaries were early the basis for controversy: the Pennsylvania-Maryland dispute was settled by the survey of Mason and Dixon (1769); the Pennsylvania-Connecticut claim was amicably settled in 1782 only after bloodshed in the Yankee-Pennamite Wars; and the Pennsylvania-Virginia altercation was solved by court action in 1779⁹⁹.

By 1755 the settlement program laid out by Penn after the Treaty of Shackamaxon⁹⁹ with the Indians (1682) was completely disrupted. The Scotch-Irish frontiersmen complained of unequal representation in the assembly, and consequent neglect of their needs by the wealthy, lawmaking, metropolitan Quakers. Ever pushing forward, the Scotch-Irish pioneer often invaded Indian territory, inciting the Indians, and finally, the rivalry of the French and the English for supremacy in the Ohio Valley projected the French and Indian War⁹⁹.

Near Fort Duquesne⁹⁹, established on the present site of Pittsburgh, was the scene (July 9, 1755) of Braddock's overwhelming defeat⁹⁹ by the French. After suffering many Indian attacks, the frontier settlers sought protection in the forts established in part by the aid of Franklin. In this period, the pacific policy of the Quaker had been tested, found inadequate, and Quaker political domination waned as revolutionary forces sought to overthrow the proprietary government. Gen. Forbes⁹⁹ recaptured Fort Duquesne (1758) for the English and named it Fort Pitt⁹⁹. With the conquest of Montreal (1760) all Pennsylvania became English territory. Pontiac's War⁹⁹ (1763) visited another Indian war upon Pennsylvania settlers. Col. Bouquet, after his victory at Bushy Run⁹⁹, reached Pittsburgh in time to save Fort Pitt, and inflicted heavy losses upon the Indians.

Fettered by a large Quaker and loyalist⁹⁹ population, Pennsylvania could not early join the Revolutionary cause. However, the pressure of forces generated by a strong East-West sectional antipathy and by unequal representation in the legislature, as well as the aid of such leaders as Dickinson, Mifflin and Reed, finally hammered away the last shackle, and the state joined in the Declaration of Independence⁹⁹, which was signed at the State House or Independence Hall⁹⁹ in Philadelphia. The two Continental Congresses⁹⁹ (1774 and 1775-81) were also held here. During Howe's occupation of Philadelphia (1777-78) Congress moved to Lancaster, York and Princeton; the Liberty Bell⁹⁹ was hastily removed to Allentown; the British held the brilliant Mischianza⁹⁹ here; Washington and his army encamped at Valley Forge⁹⁹;

while Lafayette and Von Steuben joined the American forces. Franklin's diplomacy in completing, at this time, the French Alliance⁹⁹ is comparable to Washington's military prowess.

The Pennsylvania line under Wayne in the Continental army, the navy and the militia comprised Pennsylvania defense in the Revolution, and battles were fought at Brandywine (1777), Paoli (1777), Fort Mifflin (1777) and Germantown (1777)⁹⁹.

A direct result of the coming of the Revolutionary War was the overthrow of proprietary government in Pennsylvania, and the adoption of a new state constitution (September, 1776), providing for a unicameral legislature. At Philadelphia, Dec. 12, 1787, Pennsylvania ratified the Federal Constitution⁹⁹, and in 1790 revised its own liberal constitution of 1776 in conformity with the general reaction to the excessive liberalism of the Revolution; the council of censors was abolished, the office of governor restored and the bicameral legislative system adopted. During this period, the western Scotch-Irish offered resistance to an excise tax by the Whiskey Rebellion⁹⁹ (1794). The capital of the United States was at Philadelphia from 1790 to 1799, when it was moved to Washington. The state capital was removed to Lancaster the same year (1799) and then to Harrisburg in 1812.

The opening of iron and coal⁹⁹ mines in western Pennsylvania and anthracite mines⁹⁹ in the northern part of the state in the early 19th century caused rapid settlement in and around Lancaster and west to Pittsburgh. Canals utilized the flatboat for traffic, and with the opening of roads the Conestoga wagon and, later, railroads solved the transportation problem⁹⁹. The Philadelphia-Lancaster Turnpike (1790) was the first important road in America. By 1834 the Columbia Railroad and the Allegheny Portage Railroad⁹⁹ were completed, and also many miles of canal improvement finished (*see* Pennsylvania Canal System). However, the tremendous burden upon the state for the cost of this construction caused widespread discontent between 1840 and 1850. Philadelphia flourished as a center for shipbuilding and manufacturing, though New York early in the 19th century outdistanced her southern neighbor as a commercial rival.

With antislavery⁹⁹ sentiment widespread, Pennsylvania responded promptly with five companies of troops to President Lincoln's call for volunteers in the Civil War; and Pennsylvania was invaded at Chambersburg and Gettysburg⁹⁹.

After the Civil War, Pennsylvania, with her rich coal mines, progressed rapidly as an industrial and manufacturing center. The railroad

employees' strike of 1877⁷⁷ was settled only by calling out the state militia; the Johnstown flood⁷⁸ (1889), caused by the breaking of the dam, cost 2000 lives and over \$10,000,000 property loss; and in 1892 the strike of the Carnegie Steel workers at Homestead⁷⁹ was so violent that martial law had to be declared; a coal strike called in Hazleton (1900) was only the forerunner of a general strike throughout this region in 1902 (see Anthracite Strike).

Following the Civil War the recently formed Republican party⁸⁰ reigned supreme; and politics were dominated by the Cameron-Quay-Penrose machine. Until his death in 1921, Boies Penrose held the reins of this party, which controlled political patronage affecting the distribution of state funds, support of the Pennsylvania Railroad⁸¹ and other large state corporations; while the weight of this party could influence even national elections.

[W. F. Dunaway, *History of Pennsylvania*.]

JULIAN P. BOYD

Pennsylvania, Invasion of. Victory at Chancellorsville⁸² presented Lee (C.) with two problems—army reorganization and what to do next. As to the first, Lee decided to divide his army into three corps—Longstreet remained in command of the first; Ewell and A. P. Hill commanded the other two. The cavalry was increased and the artillery reorganized. All this involved the mixing of old and new units, the breaking up of associations of long standing and the introduction of many new leaders. "To explain this reorganization is to explain Gettysburg."

While these changes were being made, Lee was developing a plan for future operations. He thought a victory on Northern soil an essential to Confederate success. He would free Virginia and meet and destroy his opponent. Davis, not appreciating the tremendous moral effect of the Emancipation Proclamation⁸³, still looked to foreign recognition as a means of saving the Confederacy, meantime adhering to his original military policy of holding territory regardless of its importance or strategic value. Others urged troop transfers on interior lines within the Confederacy. Key areas were menaced—Grant (U.) was threatening Vicksburg⁸⁴ and Bragg (C.) in Tennessee felt too weak to take the offensive (see Tullahoma Campaign). Lee's plan of invasion was adopted. He believed that success would relieve pressure on other areas and that Northern public opinion would force a peaceable settlement.

The delicate operation of maneuvering Hooker (U.) out of his positions behind the Rappa-

hannock was begun on June 3, 1863. Lee planned to use the Shenandoah and Cumberland valleys as covered avenues of approach into Pennsylvania. By June 12 Hooker had begun to move northward so as to keep between Lee and the capital at Washington. On June 23 the Confederate Army was crossing the Potomac, Stuart (C.) and his cavalry rode off to harass Hooker's army and then to pass between it and Washington, cross into Maryland and rejoin Lee in Pennsylvania. In retrospect it was a fatal detachment. On June 27 Hooker, feeling he had lost the support of his government, resigned. Meade succeeded him. The Confederate Army, living off the country, was moving into Pennsylvania, when Lee, learning that Meade was in pursuit, on June 29, ordered a concentration of his scattered army. Stuart's unfortunate absence had deprived Lee of exact knowledge of enemy movements and position. As a result, A. P. Hill's troops, investigating the character and strength of a Union cavalry force in Gettysburg⁸⁵, inadvertently and accidentally brought on the three-day battle that ended in Confederate defeat.

All during July 4 Lee waited in position for Meade's counterattack, but none was made. After dark the Confederate Army began to withdraw. The retreat, skilfully conducted, was made in driving rain that turned the roads into quagmires. By the 6th the army was at Hagerstown drawn up to repel Meade's expected attack. But Meade did not begin pursuit until July 5, moving cautiously as he went. Lee moved back slowly to the Potomac at Williamsport, where flood waters compelled another halt. Meade, following, hesitated to attack and by the time he reached a decision the river had fallen sufficiently to permit Lee's army, during July 13 and 14, to cross over into Virginia. Early in August the Confederate Army had taken position south of the Rapidan River to protect Richmond from any move by Meade's army. On Aug. 8 Lee, assuming complete responsibility for the failure of the campaign, asked President Davis to select some one else to command the army. Davis refused, asking, "Where am I to find the new commander?" In disaster Lee blamed no one but himself and in disaster his faith was unshaken.

[D. S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Pennsylvania, The University of, located in Philadelphia, was founded by Benjamin Franklin (*Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pensilvania*, 1749) and traces its beginnings to a Charity School established in 1740. Associated with it were ten signers of the Decla-

ration of Independence, nine signers of the Constitution and twenty-four members of the Continental Congress. Its college was the first in America to depart from theological educational purposes and establish a comprehensive liberal curriculum, and the first to become a university (1779). The university's thirteen schools and many departments today (1939) include America's first school of medicine (1765), first university teaching hospital (1874), first university school of business (1881), first psychological clinic (1896), as well as divisions in arts and science, dentistry, veterinary medicine, engineering, law education and the fine arts.

THOMAS SOVEREIGN GATES

Pennsylvania and Ohio Canal, THE, planned as a short cut from Pennsylvania to Lake Erie, ran from the Ohio River near Pittsburgh to Akron, where it connected with the Ohio and Erie Canal^o. The Ohio legislature in 1836 subscribed to one third of its entire stock issue, and the canal was opened in 1840. In 1854 the Cleveland & Mahoning Railroad obtained a controlling interest in it, and it soon fell into disuse. By 1874 it was permanently closed.

[Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Towpaths*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Pennsylvania Canal System, THE. Not only was Pennsylvania jealous of New York's fame through the building of the Erie Canal^o, but Philadelphia's western trade was menaced by it. In 1826 the Pennsylvania legislature passed an act for state construction of a waterway from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, and ground was broken at once. From Philadelphia to Columbia on the Susquehanna, 81.6 miles, a railroad instead of a canal was built, and opened in 1834. From Columbia the canal followed the Susquehanna and Juniata rivers to Hollidaysburg whence the Portage Railroad carried the line over the mountains to Johnstown; from there the canal continued to Pittsburgh. Several auxiliary canals were authorized, and work on them began in 1828. Leaving the Main Line at the mouth of the Juniata, one of them ran up the Susquehanna to Northumberland, where it forked, one line following the West Branch of the Susquehanna past Lewisburg and Williamsport, the other the North Branch past Wilkes-Barre toward the New York state line. The Delaware Division, following the Delaware River from the mouth of the Lehigh down to tidewater at Bristol, was in effect a continuation of the Lehigh Canal, privately built from mines at Mauch Chunk and above, down to the Delaware.

Some short branch canals were built, the Monongahela River was improved with locks and dams, and a canal was projected from the Ohio River near Pittsburgh to Lake Erie, of which only thirty-one miles were ever built. By 1840 there were 606 miles of canal and 118 miles of railroad in the system, and the expense incurred and authorized then stood at \$32,000,000, though the original estimate had been \$5,000,000. On Feb. 1, 1840, for the first time in her history, Pennsylvania defaulted in the payment of interest on her bonds. Thoroughly alarmed, the legislature halted construction throughout the whole system, and in some places it was never again begun. Although the tolls could not pay expenses and interest, the system was enormously useful in getting the state's coal and other products to market, in capturing a considerable portion of the trade of the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, and, in general, in developing Pennsylvania into one of the nation's greatest commercial and industrial states.

In 1846 the Pennsylvania Railroad^o was chartered to build a line paralleling the main canal from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh; but prosperity was returning, and though the canal debt had by 1848 risen to \$40,000,000, the state was still hopeful. But the yearly balance sheets proved that these internal improvements were being operated at a loss, and the governor was authorized to offer the Main Line for sale. In 1857 the Pennsylvania Railroad bought it for \$7,500,000, and promptly shut down the Portage Railroad. In 1863-64 it abandoned the west end, from Johnstown to Pittsburgh. The eastern section in 1866 was turned over to a subsidiary corporation, the Pennsylvania Canal Company. In 1858 the state sold the Delaware, Susquehanna, North and West Branch divisions to the Sunbury & Erie Railroad for \$3,500,000. The railroad resold all these to companies organized to operate them. The North Branch was extended to Athens, where it connected with the New York state canal system, but the portion of it above Wilkes-Barre was wrecked by a flood in 1865, and the Lehigh Valley Railroad was built on its right of way. In 1871 the Pennsylvania Canal Company was operating 358 miles of the old system—the east end of the Main Line and portions of the Susquehanna, North and West Branch divisions—and carried over 1,000,000 tons of freight that year, but thereafter its business declined. In 1889 the eastern fragment of the Main Line was wrecked by a flood and never fully rebuilt. In 1904 the last mile of canal along the Susquehanna was abandoned. The Delaware Division, leased in 1866 by the Lehigh Coal and Naviga-

tion Company, continued to operate as long as its sister canal, the Lehigh, functioned. Both ceased operation in 1931.

[Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Townships*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Pennsylvania-Connecticut Boundary Dispute. THE, had its origin in the overlapping territorial jurisdictions of the charters granted by Charles II to Connecticut (1662) and to William Penn (1681). The crown attorney general, Sir William Jones, admitted when Penn's charter was before him in 1681 that Connecticut had a real but impracticable claim to the lands within the whole breadth of the 41st degree of latitude, but Connecticut made no effort to give force to that right until 1774, when she gave official support to the demands of the twenty-year-old Susquehanna Company^o by erecting the township of Westmoreland embracing what is now the entire northeastern portion of Pennsylvania. A year later this territory was made a county under Connecticut jurisdiction and its inhabitants maintained possession by force of arms in the Yankee-Pennamite Wars^o. Westmoreland County officials were appointed by Connecticut authority, her representatives sat in the Connecticut legislature and her companies of militia were organized under the Connecticut line from 1775 to 1782. In the latter year, by reason of a petition from Pennsylvania to the Continental Congress^o, an interstate commission was organized under the terms set forth in Article IX of the Articles of Confederation^o, and on Dec. 30, 1782, this commission unanimously awarded jurisdiction of the territory in dispute to Pennsylvania. This was the only interstate trial held under the Articles of Confederation, and while the official dispute between Connecticut and Pennsylvania lasted only from 1775 to 1782, the actual conflict of private titles under the two charters originated about 1750 and was not finally settled until the first quarter of the 19th century.

[J. P. Boyd, ed., *The Susquehanna Company Papers*.]

JULIAN P. BOYD

Pennsylvania Dutch. See Pennsylvania Germans, The.

Pennsylvania Gazette, The, was established by Samuel Keimer at Philadelphia, Dec. 24, 1728, under the title *The Universal Instructor in All Arts and Sciences: and Pennsylvania Gazette*, as the second newspaper in the Middle Colonies. It was not successful and on Oct. 2, 1729, Keimer sold it to Benjamin Franklin and Hugh Meredith who continued it as *The Pennsylvania Ga-*

zette. Meredith retired in 1732 and Franklin became sole owner, competing with Bradford's *Mercury*. Franklin's ingenuity soon made the *Gazette* the most successful colonial newspaper. He introduced the editorial column, humor, the first weather report and the first cartoon, exerting tremendous influence on journalism. On Jan. 12, 1748, he admitted David Hall to a partnership which continued until 1766 when Franklin retired. That year Hall formed a partnership with William Sellers which lasted until Hall's death (1772) when his son, William Hall, succeeded him. Occupation of Philadelphia by the British necessitated issuing the paper at York from December, 1777, to June, 1778. Sellers died in 1804, and four years later William Hall, Jr. took George W. Pierie into partnership. Hall died in 1813, and Pierie in 1814. Although stating that it would probably be resumed in May, 1816, the issue of Oct. 11, 1815, proved to be the last one of *The Pennsylvania Gazette*.

[Clarence S. Brigham, *Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820*, in *Proceedings of The American Antiquarian Society*, XXXII.]

JULIAN P. BOYD

Pennsylvania Germans, The, commonly but erroneously called "Pennsylvania Dutch," are a distinctive people with a history all their own and are not to be confused with the general mass of German-Americans. Entering Pennsylvania among the first settlers under Penn's charter, they increased somewhat slowly at first, but after 1727, when the heavy Palatine^o immigration set in, their increase was rapid. At the time of the Revolution they composed about a third of the population of the province, and now (1939) number perhaps 2,000,000 of the more than 3,000,000 inhabitants of German descent in Pennsylvania.

Settling in the southeastern part of the colony, between the English on the east and the Scotch-Irish^o on the west, they occupied a well-defined geographical area, frequently referred to as Pennsylvania-German Land, where they predominate overwhelmingly. This region embraces the present counties of Northampton, Lehigh, Berks, Lancaster, Lebanon and York, and adjacent districts, though many Pennsylvania Germans are found elsewhere in the state. In the area occupied by them in predominant numbers they developed a distinctive civilization, which, by reason of the Pennsylvania-Dutch dialect and of a strong racial consciousness, together with a certain conservatism, tends to perpetuate itself. Though considerably modified by the assimilating influences roundabout, the distinctive characteristics of this racial group have persisted to

a remarkable degree down to the present time, especially in the rural districts.

[Oscar Kuhns, *German and Swiss Settlements of Colonial Pennsylvania*; J. L. Rosenberger, *Pennsylvania Germans*.]
WAYLAND F. DUNAWAY

Pennsylvania Hospital, THE, of Philadelphia, is the oldest hospital^m in the United States. Chartered in 1751, it was founded by Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Bond. The buildings originally erected for it, 1755-94, at 8th and Spruce streets, are still in use. John Morgan, William Shippen, Jr., Benjamin Rush and Philip Syng Physick were early members of its staff, and the board of managers has always consisted of representative citizens of Philadelphia. Its records show the admission of many victims of the French and Indian wars, including soldiers from Braddock's army. During the Revolution its facilities were made use of by both the British and Continental armies during their occupation of Philadelphia. The earliest clinical lectures in America were given in its wards by Thomas Bond, and the oldest clinical amphitheater (1804) is still shown.

[T. G. Morton, *History of the Pennsylvania Hospital*.]

FRANCIS R. PACKARD

Pennsylvania-Maryland Boundary Dispute, THE, grew out of ambiguous terms of territorial grants by the crown to William Penn (1681) and to Lord Baltimore (1632). Shortly after his arrival in America, Penn held a conference with Lord Baltimore and presented a letter from Charles II ordering both parties to determine the boundaries and Baltimore to take two degrees northward, sixty miles to a degree. Baltimore objected to the two degrees and Penn then urged him to take two and a half, measuring northward from Watkins Point on the Chesapeake. Fortunately for Penn, Baltimore declined this proposition which would have put his northern line twenty miles above Philadelphia. Baltimore then issued a proclamation offering lands in the disputed area in larger quantities and at cheaper prices than Penn was willing to grant. Thereupon Penn appealed to the Privy Council^m. In 1685 an order in council was issued that the region bounded on the east by the Atlantic and the river and bay of Delaware, and on the west by Chesapeake Bay, should be divided into equal parts by a line drawn from the latitude of Cape Henlopen northward to 40° N. Lat., the eastern half of which should belong to the king and the western half to Baltimore. From this time on invasions from Maryland into the Delaware Counties^m were made, Pennsylvania settlers were brought before Maryland courts, their houses burned and their crops and cattle destroyed or

stolen. In 1708 Baltimore petitioned the crown to set aside the order of 1685, on the ground that it had been surreptitiously obtained and was false in its statements. Penn countered with another petition and was sustained. Baltimore again petitioned in 1709, but was dismissed and the order of 1685 commanded to be put in execution. Actual jurisdiction over the Lower Counties had been exercised by Pennsylvania since 1693 and on four occasions between 1704 and 1724 the Maryland assembly admitted they were annexed to Pennsylvania. Baltimore effected an agreement with Penn's widow in 1724, but her death and the infancy of the Pennsylvania proprietors delayed its execution. In 1731 Baltimore petitioned the crown to order the Penns to join with him in settling the boundaries, and in 1732 an agreement with the Penn family was drawn up. Commissioners were appointed to run the line, but could not agree. In 1735 the Penns presented in chancery a bill which gave an exhaustive statement of all of the points at issue. This case was dragged on at enormous expense. Eminent crown lawyers were employed on both sides, ancient documents were examined in England and America. Finally in 1750 Lord Chancellor Hardwicke pronounced his decree: that the agreement of 1732 should be enforced, and that commissioners to ascertain the boundaries should be appointed within three months. But again a deadlock ensued, when the Penns received in chancery an order to reopen the proceedings. In 1760 Baltimore entered into a final agreement with the Penns and in 1762 the chancellor ordered it to be executed. Commissioners were again appointed, but the actual running of the lines was entrusted to two expert surveyors, Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon. In 1767 Mason and Dixon^m finally located at 39° 44' the famous northern line of Maryland which has since borne their names, and thus brought to an end a tedious and costly dispute that had lasted through most of a century. This boundary was ratified by an order in council, Jan. 11, 1769.

[W. R. Shepherd, *History of Proprietary Government in Pennsylvania*.]
JULIAN P. BOYD

Pennsylvania Prison System, THE, was first developed in Cherry Hill Penitentiary, erected at Philadelphia, 1829-35. Prisoners were confined in large, solitary cells, which flanked corridors that branched out from a central control room like the spokes of a great stone wheel. Separate walled exercise yards adjoined the backs of most of the cells. The inmates spent their years of confinement in solitude, laboring at various handicrafts, and saw no one except prison

officers or the chaplain. The system required a minimum of discipline, and was widely copied in Europe; but its great expense prevented its spread in the United States, and the practice of solitary confinement was abandoned even at Cherry Hill in the 1880's.

[Harry E. Barnes, *The Evolution of Penology in Pennsylvania*; Blake McKelvey, *American Prisons*.]

BLAKE MCKELVEY

Pennsylvania Railroad, THE, is one of the five main trunk lines connecting St. Louis and Chicago with the Atlantic seaboard. It was begun as a local project to safeguard the trade of Philadelphia against competition of the Erie Canal on the north and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroadsm on the south. The charter, signed April 13, 1846, by Gov. Shunk, provided for the extension of the state and privately owned lines between Philadelphia and Harrisburg to Pittsburgh. Work of construction was begun at Meadow Lane, Harrisburg, July 7, 1847. On Dec. 10, 1852, a continuous single-track railroad was opened between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

During its early years the Pennsylvania Railroad was seriously handicapped by one of the terms of its charter providing for a tonnage tax of five mills per ton mile, imposed to protect the state-owned transportation system from competition by the new railroad (see Pennsylvania Canal System). This was later reduced to three mills per ton mile and removed from coal and lumber. On Aug. 1, 1857, the Pennsylvania Railroad purchased the main line of public works of Pennsylvania, but the supreme court of the state refused to uphold that section of the purchase act which removed the tonnage tax. After a bitter legislative struggle this was finally repealed in 1861.

During the Civil War the railroad achieved national recognition because of its valuable work in transporting troops and supplies. Thomas A. Scott, vice-president of the railroad, was given the rank of colonel and appointed assistant secretary of war. After the war the Pennsylvania Railroad expanded rapidly, commanding for Philadelphia a fair share of commerce from the growing wealth of the West, and opening new markets for the great industrial products of Pennsylvania.

The present Pennsylvania system, of approximately 11,000 miles, originally comprised about 600 different corporations; it now consists of approximately sixty transportation corporations and about thirty warehouse, water-supply and real-estate companies. It serves thirteen states and exchanges freight with 157 railroads at 750 exchange points. Electrification was begun in

the spring of 1929 and on April 14, 1938, the Pennsylvania Railroad announced that the railroad passenger and freight trackage had been completely electrified on all the principal lines of the entire eastern seaboard territory, embracing the area between New York on the north, Washington on the south, Philadelphia on the east and Harrisburg on the west. This comprises a total of 2677 miles of electrified trackage, or 41% of the total electrically operated railroad track in the United States.

[Stanton Ling Davis, *Pennsylvania Politics, 1860-1863*; Alexander K. McClure, *Old Time Notes of Pennsylvania*; Howard W. Shotter, *The Growth and Development of the Pennsylvania Railroad, 1846-1926*; Walter M. Splawn, *Consolidation of Railroads*; John W. Starr, *One Hundred Years of American Railroadng*.]

STANTON LING DAVIS

Pennsylvania Troops, Mutinies of. On Jan. 1, 1781, Pennsylvania troops stationed at Morristownsm mutinied, killed and wounded several officers, and on Jan. 3 started for Philadelphia to place before Congress demands for back pay, food, clothing and adjustment of enlistment terms. At Trenton the troops were met by Joseph Reed, president of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania, who, Jan. 11, secured acceptance by the mutineers of an agreement adjusting their demands. They then returned to Morristown.

On June 13, 1783, some Pennsylvania troops, in Philadelphia for discharge, presented a memorial demanding pay due them. Lancaster detachments soon joined the malcontents. Irresolution characterized the reply by Congress, then sitting in Philadelphia. The mutineers became insolent in their demands and conduct, and on June 21 made a public demonstration. Congress, still temporizing, adjourned to Princeton. The mutineers, hearing of the approach of troops from Washington's army under Gen. Robert Howe, dispersed or surrendered. Congress did not sit again in Philadelphia until 1790.

[L. C. Hatch, *The Administration of the American Revolutionary Army*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Pennsylvania-Virginia Boundary Dispute. This dispute had its origin in the ambiguous terms of the grant of 1681 to William Penn and the claim of Virginia to extend "from sea to sea, west and northwest" over any territory not covered by royal grants. The questions at issue were whether the 39th or the 40th parallel was the southern boundary of Pennsylvania and how the western boundary, which was to be five degrees west of the Delaware River, should be drawn. Prior to the French and Indian Warsm Virginia claimed most of what is now southwestern Penn-

sylvania, including the district around the Forks of the Ohio^o, and attempted to settle it by means of the Ohio Company^o. The survey of Mason and Dixon's line^o, 1763-67, made it clear that Pennsylvania extended some distance west of the mountains, and in 1773 Pennsylvania established Westmoreland County in the disputed territory. Early in 1774 Dr. John Connolly, acting on instructions from the governor of Virginia, took possession of Fort Pitt^o and organized a company of Virginia militia in the region; and in the following year Virginia included the disputed territory in the District of West Augusta and set up a court at Pittsburgh.

The efforts of rival magistrates to exercise jurisdiction over each other resulted in disorders in 1774 and 1775, but the advent of the Revolution and the consequent necessity of co-operation against Tories^o and Indians put a stop to them, and thereafter the authority of Pennsylvania was generally recognized in what is now Westmoreland County and that of Virginia in the Monongahela Valley. In 1779 joint commissioners of the two states agreed to settle the dispute by extending Mason and Dixon's line, which is about a quarter of a degree south of the 40th parallel, to a point five degrees west of the Delaware River and by running the western boundary of Pennsylvania due north from that point. The Pennsylvania assembly promptly ratified the commissioners' decision, but the Virginia assembly waited until commissioners had confirmed the land claims of Virginians in the region and then ratified with the proviso that such claims should be valid.

[S. J. and E. H. Buck, *The Planting of Civilization in Western Pennsylvania*; Boyd Crumrine, *The Boundary Controversy between Pennsylvania and Virginia, 1748-1785*, in *Annals of Carnegie Museum*, Vol. I.]

SOLON J. BUCK

Penobscot (later Castine^o), the peninsula at the mouth of Maine's largest river of the same name, near the almost mythical Indian Norumbega^o, city of jewels and furs, held by five different nations in turn, was the strategic center of the battleground of the French and the English for the possession of Maine. Explored by both, the site of a trading post of the Plymouth plantation^o, sacked by the French in 1631 and captured in 1633, it was held, in spite of Myles Standish's attack, by the Frenchman Aulney, until its recapture by the Puritans in 1654. Returned to the French by the Treaty of Breda^o in 1670, it became the seat of the picturesque Baron Castine, who left the French army to become an Indian nabob and philosopher, husband of a Penobscot princess and a lord of furs. But

this noble experiment in "going Indian" was interrupted by King Philip's War^o, and Baron Castine and his half-breed son became the leaders of the Indians in the fighting for many years. This important stronghold of Castine never became completely English until Quebec fell in 1759.

[Henry S. Burrage, *The Beginnings of Colonial Maine*; Robert P. Tristram Coffin, *Kennebec*.]

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

Penobscot Expedition, THE, was an attempt by Massachusetts to dislodge the British from Castine^o, which they had occupied in June, 1779. Nineteen armed vessels with over 2000 men, commanded by Dudley Saltonstall, together with twenty-four transports carrying about 900 militia under Solomon Lovell, with Paul Revere as chief of artillery, arrived at Penobscot July 25, 1779. Lovell's forces made a courageous landing, but Saltonstall failed to co-operate. When British naval reinforcements arrived on Aug. 13, Saltonstall hardly attempted a defense and lost nearly all his vessels, most of them being fired by their crews to prevent capture. Ill-conceived, ill-planned and worse executed, the expedition cost Massachusetts £1,739,000 in inflated currency and nearly its whole trading fleet.

[G. W. Allen, *A Naval History of the American Revolution*.]

ROBERT E. MOODY

Penole, originating in the Spanish Southwest, was of great value to early travelers whose rations were reduced to essentials. It was compounded of crushed parched corn, sugar or molasses, and cinnamon, although the last could be dispensed with. The traveler, without necessarily cooking it, mixed penole with water and found it nutritious if not delicious. A man could live for a month on a half bushel. Lt. Brewerton called penole invaluable to travelers in the Far West.

[W. J. Ghent, *Road to Oregon*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Pensacola, Fla. The first settlement at Pensacola, soon abandoned, was that of Tristan de Luna in 1539. Over 100 years later, in November, 1698, Arriola reached Pensacola Bay and established San Carlos de Austria, near the present site of Fort Barrancas, as a protection against French encroachments. Within a few months the French settled the lower Mississippi region. In 1719 when war was declared, Bienville seized the town, only to have his prize at once recaptured. The French attacked a second time and burned the settlement; but after peace was made Pensacola was restored to Spain (1723). The Spaniards now made their settlement on Santa Rosa

Island, whence a hurricane in 1754 drove them back to the mainland.

In 1763 the British obtained Florida (*see* Florida, British). They divided it at the Apalachicola into two provinces, Pensacola becoming the government seat of West Florida⁷⁰. The trading house of Panton, Leslie & Co.⁷¹ was organized with headquarters at Pensacola, and the city, until then a wretched place of "forty huts and a barracks," rose to its most prosperous period prior to the Civil War. During the American Revolution, Pensacola was involved in intrigues, and after Spain entered the war against England it was captured by Bernardo de Galvez in May, 1781.

Florida was restored to Spain in 1783 (*see* Definitive Treaty of Peace) and Pensacola lost its importance, although it remained the headquarters of Panton, Leslie & Co. During the War of 1812⁷² the British attempted to use it as a base of operations, whereupon the city was seized by Andrew Jackson (1814) and the British were expelled. Jackson again occupied Pensacola in 1818 on the grounds that Spain was harboring hostile Seminoles⁷³. After fourteen months it was restored.

When the United States obtained Florida, the formal cession took place in Pensacola July 17, 1821 (*see* Adams-Onís Treaty; Florida, Purchase of). In 1822 the first legislative council met there, and the town was soon full of land speculators, who were attracted by the road then being started from Pensacola to St. Augustine⁷⁴. A second real-estate boom took place because of a projected railroad, but the scheme collapsed and by 1839 Pensacola's population was less than 2000.

On Jan. 12, 1861, Fort Barrancas and the navy yard were surrendered to the Confederates. Fort Pickens⁷⁵ on Santa Rosa Island remained in Union hands, and from this base Federal troops retook the city (1862).

[Richard C. Campbell, *Colonial Florida*, Dorothy Dodd, The New City of Pensacola, in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, April, 1931; John Lee Williams, *Territory of Florida*.]

KATHRYN T. ABBEY

Pensacola, The Congress of (1765), was attended by chiefs and warriors of the Upper and Lower divisions of the Creek⁷⁶ nation of Indians, private traders, the governor and council of West Florida⁷⁷, and Indian Superintendent John Stuart. The resultant treaty laid down a definite boundary—a line running along the coast and about fifteen miles inland—between red and white territories and provided for the elimination of certain irregularities in the peltry traffic, notably by annexing to the treaty a tariff of rates

at which traders must dispose of their goods. Although it had soon to be revised, the treaty served to allay Anglo-Creek friction at a time when English relations with Indian nations along the entire frontier were highly unsettled.

[C. E. Carter, British Policy towards the American Indians in the South, 1763-8, in *English Historical Review*, XXXIII, D. Rowland, ed., *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1766: English Dominion*, Vol. I.]

W. NEIL FRANKLIN

Pensacola Treaty (1784). *See* Spanish-Indian Relations (1783-1803).

Pensions, Military and Naval. The United States has granted pensions to participants in all its wars, including Indian wars, and to the regular army and navy in peacetime. They may be classified as (1) pensions for injuries incurred in the service or to dependents of those whose death was caused by the service; (2) qualified service pensions for service of specified length combined with some other qualification, such as age, disability, or indigence; and (3) for service alone, usually granted to aged survivors long after the war.

Before 1817 our wars were fought mainly by volunteer armies. Pensions were offered as inducements to enlistment in colonial wars and in the Revolution. Early Federal enactments granting Revolutionary pensions provided only for disabilities incurred in the service. The first service pension law was in 1818, and the first pensions for widows of Revolutionary soldiers in 1836.

A separate system for the regular army and navy was established in 1790. The acts raising troops for the War of 1812 and the Mexican War promised the volunteers the same pensions as the regulars, and acts increasing these pensions before 1862 applied alike to the army and navy, the War of 1812 and the Mexican War. The first service pension was granted for the War of 1812 in 1871, and for the Mexican War in 1887.

Two innovations appeared during the Civil War. First, the "general laws" of 1862, providing uniform pensions on account of death or disability of service origin for both regulars and volunteers of the armed forces, applied to future wars. Second, certain "specific disabilities" were pensioned in 1864 at higher rates than under the general laws. Thereafter both the number of these disabilities and the rates rose rapidly.

The total cost of pensions before 1861 was about \$90,000,000. By 1918 it was nearly \$5,396,000,000, mostly on account of the Civil War. By 1937 it was over \$12,883,000,000. This increase

was not only because of larger armies. A combination of political factors, including patriotism, the soldier vote, veterans' lobbies and pension attorneys, helped to give the United States the most generous pension system in the world. Cleveland's vetoes of private pension bills and of the Dependent Pension Bill of 1887 made the subject an exciting issue in the election of 1888. The act of 1890 gave a qualified service pension to Civil War veterans who, from any cause, were incapacitated for performing manual labor. In 1904 an administrative order made age above sixty-two years a pensionable disability under this act. Congress recognized this principle in acts of 1907 and 1912, which graduated payment according to age and length of service. The first Civil War pension for service alone was enacted in 1920.

At the beginning of the Spanish-American War volunteers and state militia were specifically granted the same pensions as regulars. In 1920 a qualified service pension was given to all above sixty-two years old. In the reductions of 1933 they were placed in the same status as World War veterans, but their former pensions were restored in 1935.

The World War brought a fundamental change. A carefully thought out plan, based partly on experience with workmen's compensation^o, provided compensation for injuries adjusted according to earning capacity. Hope that this would end objectionable features of the pension system proved illusory. The period between 1920 and 1933 saw a most rapid liberalization of the laws, from causes similar to those operative after the Civil War. By 1933 the pension system had completely replaced the idea of compensation. Legislative presumptions that certain diseases appearing long afterward originated in the service created what amounted to qualified service pensions. After 1929 the high cost of pensions led to demands for retrenchment. In 1933 rates were reduced for the first time since 1820, and payments for causes not of service origin were abolished. The process of whittling away these reductions began almost immediately, and in 1935 the laws in effect before the act of 1933 were re-enacted. Moreover, some new "non service connected" pensions had appeared, such as those granted to widows and minor children of World War and Spanish-American War veterans. (See also Bonus.)

The peacetime establishments of the army and navy are pensioned only for death or disability caused "in the service and in line of duty," at lower rates than participants in most wars. Retirement allowances after many years of service

are not considered pensions in the United States, the theory being that retired officers and men are still in the service and subject to call.

[W. H. Glasson, *Federal Military Pensions in the United States*; G. A. Weber and L. F. Schmeckebier, *The Veteran's Administration*; J. W. Oliver, *History of the Civil War Military Pensions*.]

DONALD L. McMURRY

Pensions, Old Age. See Social Security; Old Age; Townsend Plan.

Pensions: The Arrears Pension Act, passed Jan. 25, 1879, was the most significant and costly piece of pension legislation of the post Civil War period. It was passed in response to a definite, well-organized, skilful lobby, led by the *National Tribune*^o, the "soldier sheet" of that day. Briefly stated, the act provided that all pensions which had been granted under previous laws, and all that were to be granted in the future, were to commence from the date of discharge. The rates for the period during which arrears of pensions were to be granted were to be the same as those for which the pension was originally allowed. The bill was admittedly a bid for the soldier vote. It received only four negative votes in the House and only four negative votes in the Senate, excluding the Southern congressmen and senators, most of whom refrained from voting. While under discussion, the estimated cost of the bill was placed at \$35,000,000. But within two years President Arthur had placed the cost at \$250,000,000. For years this act continued to prove the most burdensome piece of pension legislation in United States history.

[John W. Oliver, *History of the Civil War Military Pensions*; *Cong'l Record*, 43rd Congress, 1st Session, *Annual Reports of U. S. Commissioner of Pensions*, 1880 and following.]

JOHN W. OLIVER

Pentagoet, Fort, located in what is now Castine^o, Maine, was the advanced eastern post of the French in New England. Erected about 1635, near the site of an English trading house destroyed by the French, Fort Pentagoet remained one of the French strongholds during the period of the French and Indian wars.

[G. A. Wheeler, *Fort Pentagoet and the French Occupation of Castine, in Maine Historical Society Collections*, 2nd series, Vol. IV.]

ELIZABETH RING

Peonage is that involuntary servitude under which a debtor is forced to make payment to a master by his labor. It differs from slavery, serfdom and contract labor by both the necessary element of indebtedness and the indefinite term

of service. While not wholly confined to the Negro in the United States, peonage developed in the South after the abolition of slavery. Here fines imposed for petty crime were paid by an employer who exacted work from the sentenced. Where agricultural laborers or tenants were advanced cash or supplies, any attempt to leave was interpreted under state statutes as obtaining credit under "false pretenses," a criminal offense. Peonage did not lose its legal sanction until 1910, when the United States Supreme Court (*Bailey v. Alabama*, 219 U. S. 219) declared such state laws to be in violation of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth amendments⁹⁹. Prosecuted under Federal laws, peonage has been greatly decreased but by no means completely eradicated.

RUPERT B. VANCE

People's Party. See Populist Party.

Peoria, Ill., was the site of the first permanent French settlement in the Illinois Country¹⁰⁰. La Salle built Fort Crèvecoeur¹⁰¹ in 1680, near the lower outlet of Peoria Lake. In 1691-92 Tonti and LaForest erected Fort St. Louis, later named Fort Pimitoui¹⁰², which probably survived until the transfer of the Illinois Country to Great Britain (see Paris, Treaty of, 1763). In 1778 a new village was founded on a near-by site, also within the limits of the present city. At the outbreak of the War of 1812 this village was believed to be a breeding place of Indian raids. The first of two militia expeditions (1812) destroyed an Indian village at the head of the lake, while the second plundered and partly burned the French settlement. Fort Clark¹⁰³ was built the following year.

American settlement began at Peoria in 1819. For some years its growth was slow, but since 1880 it has been the second largest city in Illinois.

[C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country, 1673-1818*; P. G. Rennick in *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, January, 1935; Bateman and Selby, *Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois*.]

PAUL M. ANGLE

Pequot Trail. The Pequot Indians prior to 1637 occupied the region from the Niantic River in Connecticut eastward some distance into Rhode Island. The name Pequot Trail has been attached to a much-used Indian route through this region from New London, across the Pawcatuck River to Westerly, East Greenwich and Providence. White settlers early laid out a road along or near the route, which by 1691 was a part of the post road between New York and Boston. In the 19th century the trail was paralleled successively by a turnpike, by the Shore

Line of the New Haven Railroad, and more recently by a motor highway.

[F. S. M. Crofut, *Guide to the History and Historic Sites of Connecticut*.]

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

Pequot War, THE. Prior to any white settlement in Connecticut trouble had developed between Dutch traders and the Pequots, located in the southeastern part of the region, who claimed control over the tribes farther west. Capt. Stone, an English trader, and several companions were killed by Pequots in 1633, as was Capt. John Oldham in 1636, which led to a fruitless attack by a Massachusetts Bay¹⁰⁴ expedition.

Both sides began preparations for further hostilities. Capt. John Underhill with a score of men arrived early in 1637 to strengthen Saybrook Fort, while in April some Pequots made an attack on Wethersfield, killing nine persons. It was this latter event that led the general court of the recently settled River Towns¹⁰⁵ on May 1, 1637, to declare war on the Pequots. Ninety men were levied, supplied and placed under command of Capt. John Mason. Accompanied by eighty Mohegans under Uncas, they soon made their way down the river to Saybrook¹⁰⁶. Joined by Capt. Underhill and twenty Massachusetts men, Mason took his party in boats to the country of the Narragansetts, where he conferred with their chief, Miantonomo, and received further aid. A two days' march overland brought the party to the Pequot fort at Mystic, which was surprised and burned. Only seven Indians escaped the slaughter. Some 300 braves, from other Pequot towns, decided that their only safety was in flight, and started with their women and children for the Hudson. Meanwhile, the Mason party, re-enforced by Capt. Patrick with forty Massachusetts men, returned to Saybrook, while Capt. Israel Stoughton and 120 additional Massachusetts men arrived at New London harbor. After a conference, it was decided to pursue the fleeing Pequots, who were soon caught in Sasqua swamp, near present Southport, Conn. Through the intervention of Thomas Stanton the women and children were led out of the swamp before the attack was made. The fight (July 13) resulted in the escape of about 60, and the capture of 180 Pequots who were allotted to the Mohegans, Narragansetts and Niantics and absorbed into their tribes. Many of those who escaped were hunted down, while the chief, Sassacus, was slain by the Mohawks and his scalp sent to Hartford. The Pequots, as a separate tribe, ceased to exist.

[Howard Bradstreet, *Story of the War with the Pequots Re-Told*, Connecticut Tercentenary Pamphlets.]

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

Perdicaris Affair, THE (1904), was a spectacular prelude to United States secret participation in the Algeiras Conference⁹⁹. On May 18, 1904, Jon Perdicaris, an American citizen, and his stepson, Cromwell Varley, a British subject, were abducted from their villa near Tangier by the Riffian bandit, Raisuli. The United States, with British support and using French good offices, demanded that the Moroccan sultan secure Perdicaris' release, and despatched the warship, *Brooklyn*, to Tangier. Meanwhile, the State Department came to suspect that Perdicaris had divested himself of American citizenship, but ultimately determined the question in his favor. On June 22 Secretary Hay sent the famous despatch demanding "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead," just as Perdicaris was in fact being released. Hay's despatch, hailed as robust-Rooseveltian, took the country by storm, but the dubious character of Perdicaris' citizenship was concealed until after the election.

[E. N. Anderson, *The First Moroccan Crisis, 1904-1906*; S. F. Bemis, *Diplomatic History of the United States*; Tyler Dennett, *John Hay*; A. L. P. Dennis, *Adventures in American Diplomacy, 1896-1906*.]

HAROLD E. DAVIS

Perdido River. Frontier conflict in 1719 led to the tacit acceptance of the Perdido as the boundary between French Louisiana and Spanish Florida⁹⁹. British East and West Florida⁹⁹ were in 1763 divided at the Apalachicola, but since 1783 the Perdido has been the limit of East Florida, now the State of Florida.

[Caroline M. Brevard, *History of Florida from the Treaty of 1763 to Our Own Times*.]

PHILIP COOLIDGE BROOKS

Perfectionism opposed to Lutheran and Calvinistic denial the faith that man may be perfect on earth through complete realization of the will and grace of God, freeing himself from selfishness, sin and obedience to law. For the Oneida Colony⁹⁹, most famous exponent of the theory, this implied sexual and economic communism.

[James Hastings, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*.]

ALLAN MACDONALD

Permanent Court of Arbitration. See Hague Court of Arbitration.

Perry-Elliott Controversy. At the battle of Lake Erie⁹⁹ Jesse D. Elliott, commander of the *Niagara*, did not move his ship up to support Perry. This led to much private recrimination, until in 1818 Elliott challenged Perry to a duel and Perry preferred charges against Elliott for his conduct during the engagement. The charges

were pigeonholed by the administration, but in 1821, after Perry's death, the controversy was revived. In 1839, when James Fenimore Cooper in his *History of the Navy* failed to criticize Elliott, he was violently attacked by the friends of Perry, mostly Whigs⁹⁹. Cooper thereupon sued for libel, and his restatement of the case at the trial is substantially his *The Battle of Lake Erie*, published in 1843. Although another libel suit was also won by Cooper, his earlier history was excluded from the school libraries of New York state. Recent naval historians, Mahan, for example, tend to criticize Elliott for inaction.

[T. R. Lounsbury, *James Fenimore Cooper*; A. T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812*.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Perry's Expedition to Japan. As a consequence of a growing desire in the United States to enter into commercial relations with Japan, for almost two and a half centuries hermetically sealed against all foreign intercourse except for a carefully restricted trade with the Dutch, an expedition was despatched to that country in 1852 under the command of Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry. Its objective was threefold: to effect some arrangement for the protection of American seamen and property wrecked in Japan; to obtain permission for American vessels in the Asiatic trade to secure provisions, water and fuel; and to induce the Japanese government to open up one or more of their ports for trade. A further goal in the mind of Commodore Perry was the possible acquisition of one of the outlying islands of the Japanese archipelago as an American naval base or coaling station, but this proposed move was rejected by President Pierce.

While the mission was pacific in character, it was decided to impress upon the Japanese the determination of the United States to enter into treaty relations by a show of force, and a considerable squadron, first of four war vessels and later of seven, was provided Commodore Perry. A first visit was made to the Bay of Yedo (Tokyo) in July, 1853, and formal delivery made of the President's letter to the emperor of Japan. Perry informed the Japanese authorities that he would return early the next year for a definite answer to the proposals embodied in the letter, and then withdrew his ships to the China coast.

A second visit took place in February, 1854, and conversations were commenced, near the modern site of Yokohama, looking toward conclusion of a treaty of peace and amity. Commodore Perry's firm insistence upon American rights, backed up by the strength of his naval force, and internal conditions of the empire had

combined to convince the Japanese authorities of the necessity for abandonment of their traditional policy of seclusion. On March 31, 1854, the treaty of Kanagawa, opening Japan to trade and also providing for the care of shipwrecked Americans and for facilities for provisioning American ships, was duly signed. The success of the expedition, so fruitful in its consequences for Japan and for the entire Western World, was in no small part due to the skill with which Commodore Perry combined diplomacy and naval power in overcoming Japanese reluctance to the breakdown of their isolation.

[Francis L. Hawks, *Narrative of the Expedition . . . to the China Seas and Japan.*] FOSTER RHEA DULLES

Perryville (Chaplin Hills), Battle of (Oct. 8, 1862). After Gen. Braxton Bragg (C) had attended the inauguration of the secessionist governor of Kentucky (*see* Kentucky, Invasion of), he set about gathering his scattered army to form a junction with re-enforcements under Gen. Kirby-Smith coming from Cumberland Gap^{re}. On Oct. 8, 1862, Bragg's army was drawn up in battle array near Perryville. The Union Army under Buell, marching from Louisville, unexpectedly encountered the Confederate Army. A bloody battle followed, considering the numbers engaged. The Confederates achieved a tactical success and remained in possession of the battlefield. In the night Bragg withdrew eastward to join Kirby-Smith. The following day a retirement southward toward Knoxville, Tenn., was begun.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. III.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Personal Liberty. Devotion to the concept of "personal liberty" runs through the course of American history, and, while often perverted and used as a justification for lawless practices, has been an important factor in establishing and maintaining democratic institutions. (*See also* Civil Liberties) It was a product of the great 17th-century struggle for English constitutional liberty combined with the economic and social freedom of a new and unexploited continent. Many colonists were political and religious refugees, and, with the opening of the Revolutionary era in 1763, the tradition of personal liberty and the common-law rights of Englishmen^{re} furnished a philosophical justification for resistance, was embodied in the Declaration of Independence^{re}, and exercised a profound influence on the new institutions of government. John Locke's^{re} theories as to the origin and purposes of the state were applied to the existing difficulties with the mother country. Government

was restrained both by constitutional principles and precedents, and by a higher law. Abuse of power called for the exercise of the reserved right of revolution. It followed, naturally, that all governments must be restrained by constitutional limitations and our early constitutions stressed the importance of the Bill of Rights^{re} as a safeguard for the liberty and property of the individual.

There is no complete and satisfactory definition of "liberty." The United States Supreme Court in a well-known opinion (Allgeyer v. Louisiana, 165 U. S. 578, 1897) described it as "not only the right of the citizen to be free from mere physical restraint of his person, as by incarceration, but the term is deemed to embrace the right of the citizen to be free in the enjoyment of all his faculties; to be free to use them in all lawful ways; to live and work where he will; to earn his livelihood by any lawful calling; to pursue any livelihood or avocation." Obviously, no one can enjoy absolute liberty, and there are continual clashes between conflicting "liberties." The American system of establishing constitutional guaranties of liberty, and entrusting the enforcement of these guaranties under impersonal rules of law to an independent judiciary, has, in spite of familiar weaknesses and errors, proved reasonably satisfactory.

[A. C. McLaughlin, *A Constitutional History of the United States*; C. E. Merriam, *A History of American Political Theories*; George Soule, *The Future of Liberty*, J. W. Burgess, *The Reconciliation of Government with Liberty*; L. Whipple, *The Story of Civil Liberty in the United States.*]

W. A. ROBINSON

Personal Liberty Laws. These state enactments, considered by slaveowners as a gross infringement of rights guaranteed them by the Constitution, and enumerated among the grievances justifying secession^{re} in 1861, are typical of the methods by which a group or interest may find an ethical and legal basis for evading an unwelcome obligation of the supreme law of the land. The Constitution^{re} required that fugitive slaves be delivered to the person having proper claim on them (Art. IV, Sec. II), but these general provisions required implementation; Congress provided it in the first Fugitive Slave Act^{re}, Feb. 12, 1793. Procedure for recovery was prescribed and, admittedly, safeguards against abuses such as the seizure of free Negroes^{re} under perjured testimony or affidavits were entirely inadequate. With the rise of sectional prejudice and the tendency to treat slavery as a moral question, the recovery of fugitives became increasingly difficult. Indiana (1824) and Connecticut (1838) had provided a jury trial for fugitives.

but the bulk of "personal liberty laws" were adopted after 1840 when the Supreme Court in *Prigg v. Pennsylvania*⁷ declared that state officials could not be required to execute a constitutional provision which required performance by the national authorities alone. The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850⁸, adopted after a decade of growing tension, was intended to provide adequate performance by those national authorities.

Several states in the preceding decade had forbidden their officers to perform any duties under the congressional act of 1793 or to use state jails or prisons for holding fugitives. The scope of such legislation was now greatly enlarged, ostensibly to establish and safeguard traditional rights in all questions involving "personal liberty." Rigorous requirements for identification and proof of ownership were to be met, perjury and illegal seizures were heavily penalized, and the use of the jury was in effect a promise that the runaway and his helpers would have full measure of "liberty" while the pursuer would encounter equal measure of obstruction. South Carolina in 1860 named thirteen states whose laws "nullify or render useless" any attempt to carry out the guarantees under which the slaveholding states had accepted the Constitution.

[*Prigg v. Pennsylvania*, 16 Peters 539; M. G. MacDougall, *Fugitive Slaves*; F. E. Chadwick, *Causes of the Civil War*; A. B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition*; W. H. Siebert, *Underground Railroad*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Perth Amboy, settled by the proprietors in 1684-86, became the capital (1686) and port of entry of East Jersey⁹. Winning, through the *Hester case*¹⁰, its contest for commercial independence, Perth Amboy was important during the 18th century as a slave port and transfer point to overland stage. It was a favorite residence of the colonial governors and one of the twin capitals of New Jersey until 1790.

[W. A. Whitehead, *Contributions to the Early History of Perth Amboy*.]

G. A. TITUS

Pet Banks. When the Jackson administration in 1833 determined to remove the governmental deposits from the Bank of the United States¹¹, certain state banks, popularly called "pet banks," were selected to receive future deposits. By Nov. 1, 1836, eighty-nine such banks in various states were acting as depositories of the Federal Government.

[D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

"Peter Parley," the pen name of Samuel G. Goodrich (1793-1860), poet, miscellaneous writer

and publisher, who, impressed with the "monstrous, false and pestilent" nature of nursery tales like "Little Red Riding Hood," "Puss in Boots," "Blue Beard" and "Jack the Giant-Killer," set out with didactic fervor to create books consisting of "beauty instead of deformity, goodness instead of wickedness, decency instead of vulgarity." Goodrich's first attempt was *The Tales of Peter Parley about America* (1827). Its popularity led him, with the occasional assistance of fellow New Englanders, including Hawthorne, Alcott and Lowell, to compile during the next thirty years a total of 116 Peter Parley books and 54 others. As many as 10,000,000 were circulated. They ranged from toy books for nurseries to books for amusing and instructing youth—tales of travel, history, nature and art, and works designed to cultivate a love of truth, charity, piety, virtue and patriotism. Widely used as textbooks, they gave impetus to the movement for making schoolbooks attractive and entertaining.

[S. G. Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime*.]

HARRY R. WARFEL

Peterhoff Admiralty Case, THE, elaborated the status of a blockaded river serving both a neutral and a belligerent, and applied the ultimate destination¹² rule to conditional and absolute contraband¹³. The English-owned *Peterhoff* was captured Feb. 25, 1863, near St. Thomas, Danish West Indies, en route to Matamoras, Mexico. The Rio Grande offered port facilities to both Matamoras and Brownsville, Tex. The river mouth was considered within the Federal blockade¹⁴. The *Peterhoff* was laden with all three classes of goods, noncontraband, conditional and absolute contraband. The United States Supreme Court freed the ship and noncontraband, as the blockade, though it included the Rio Grande, could not preclude free use of the port for goods legally consigned to the neutral city. The seizure of the remainder of the cargo was sustained.

[John Bassett Moore, *International Law Digest*.]

JIM DAN HILL

Petersburg, Siege of (1864-65). Severely repulsed by Lee (C.) at Cold Harbor¹⁵, Grant (U.) decided to approach Richmond from the south, through Petersburg. On June 12, 1864, he started his army to the James River, which it crossed by ferry and pontoons at Wyanoke Neck, June 14-17. His leading corps attacked Petersburg, June 15. After three days of fighting, the Federals captured the eastern defenses. Lee's army then arrived, occupied a shorter line nearer the city and repulsed the last assaults.

Grant then began siege operations on the eastern front, meantime persistently pushing his left flank southwestward to envelop Petersburg and cut the railways leading south. His first advance, June 21–22, was driven back. The battle of the Crater⁹⁷, July 30, resulted in another Federal repulse. Again striking westward, after severe fighting, Aug. 18–21, around Globe Tavern, the Federals succeeded in cutting the Weldon Railroad. In September Grant's extension of his right across the James and capture, Sept. 29, of Fort Harrison, eight miles south of Richmond, compelled Lee, also, to move much of his army north of the James and to keep it there. Thus weakened southwest of Petersburg, the Confederates lost further territory, Sept. 29–30, when Grant's left pushed forward to Peebles Farm, within two miles of the Boydton Plank Road⁹⁸. But an attempt to cut this highway by advancing across Hatcher's Run, Oct. 27, was decisively repulsed by Lee and field operations virtually ceased during the winter.

Foreseeing that when spring came his attenuated line, now thirty-five miles long, would be broken by superior numbers, Lee on March 25, 1865, assaulted Fort Stedman⁹⁹, desperately attempting to penetrate Grant's right and cut his supply railroad to City Point. The attack failed and Grant countered by sending Sheridan with heavy cavalry and infantry forces to Dinwiddie Courthouse, March 29, to destroy the Southside Railroad. Sheridan, worsted, March 31, by Pickett's and other divisions, received reinforcements and on April 1 routed Pickett at Five Forks¹⁰⁰, rendering the railroad indefensible. Lee evacuated Petersburg and Richmond April 2 and retreated westward (*see* Appomattox).

[*Official Records, Union and Confederate Armies*, Vols. XXXVI, XL; *Papers of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts*, Vol. 5; *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. IV; Douglas S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee*, Vol. IV.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Petition, The Right of, was claimed in England from an early date when the king was asked by individuals as well as groups to redress grievances. The right was exercised in Virginia as early as 1619, when the first House of Burgesses assumed that its function was to hear the governor's instructions and petition for a redress of grievances. But the later assemblies, especially in New England, came to regard themselves as the custodians of popular rights under the charters (*see* Colonial Assemblies). The Massachusetts general court in 1646 was petitioned by Dr. Child, who hoped that in this way his appeal might reach Parliament. Thus the idea was established that the legislature was the authority

from which a redress of grievances must be sought. When the state legislatures were set up under the revolutionary constitutions, the idea prevailed that they assumed all the powers of a British Parliament. Among these was the power to receive petitions.

The Federal Convention in 1787¹⁰¹ did not embody in the Constitution guarantees of individual rights, but these were required by the states as they ratified the document, and became the first ten amendments (*see* Bill of Rights). It is not surprising that the First Amendment asserts the right of petition. Affirmed in the colonial Declaration of Rights in 1765 and mentioned in the Declaration of Independence¹⁰², the right of petition was recognized as one of the rights reserved to the people. That is not to say that a petition must be read or acted upon. In the course of the slavery¹⁰³ controversy Henry Clay insisted that the right of petition required that Congress give consideration to all petitions, stating reasons for their final disposition. This view found few supporters in Congress, and in 1836 the House of Representatives voted that all abolition petitions be tabled without reading. This "gag rule"¹⁰⁴ was bitterly contested by John Quincy Adams and was finally rescinded in 1844. Occasionally attempts to exercise the right of petition have been accompanied by demonstrations. Coxey's Army¹⁰⁵, an organized group of the unemployed, marched upon Washington in 1894 and trampled the grass in the Capitol park, for which the leaders were arrested by the local police. Petitions have been presented by individuals, organized groups and state legislatures. In recent years the use of formal petitions has been supplanted largely by letters and telegrams to members of Congress (*see* Pressure Groups). Propaganda¹⁰⁶ has proved more effective than petitions. But petitions in the form of resolutions by meetings of organized groups continue to make their appearance. The constitutional right of petition today seems to be satisfied when a petition is officially received.

[E. S. Corwin, *The Constitution and What It Means Today*.]

WILLIAM S. CARPENTER

Petition and Remonstrance of New Netherland, THE. In order that the colonists might be induced to contribute to the expenses of the government Peter Stuyvesant in 1647 permitted the election of a board of Nine Men. In spite of Stuyvesant's objections, this board drew up and on July 26 and 28, 1649, signed two documents of protest to the home government. Van der Donck, Van Couwenhoven and Bout were chosen to present the appeals to the States Gen-

eral. The Petition was a short, concise statement of the condition of the province with suggested remedies. The Remonstrance was a long essay, which gave in more detail and in their historic setting the facts and grievances upon which the petitioners based their appeal for changes. The autocratic proceedings and personal characters of Governors Kieft and Stuyvesant and their councilors were set forth in forcible terms, questions were raised about the expenditure of public funds, and the administration of justice was severely criticized. "A suitable municipal government . . . adapted to this province, and somewhat resembling the laudable government of our fatherland," was requested. The need of more farmers as colonists was stated and concessions in trading rights asked. Although a new charter with enlarged trading rights was granted by the Amsterdam Chamber of the West Indies Company⁷⁰, the arbitrary powers of the director were confirmed, and Stuyvesant continued his autocratic course until April, 1652, when he was instructed by the Amsterdam Chamber to give New Amsterdam⁷¹ a "burgher government."

[A. C. Flick, ed., *History of the State of New York*, Vol. I.]

A. C. FLICK

Petitions, Antislavery, to Congress, first became a major weapon of abolition⁷² agitation in 1836. That year petitions for legislation against slavery so clogged the congressional schedule that the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives resolved thereafter to table antislavery petitions without a hearing or any other action. This, the first gag rule⁷³, was continued in varying forms until 1844. Abolitionists argued that the rule, denying as it did the right of antislavery petitions to be read in the House, involved also a denial of their constitutional right of petition⁷⁴. Though the right of petition actually was not involved in the gag rule, the abolitionists' contention was accepted in the North, and was maintained on the floor of Congress by its most famous member, John Quincy Adams.

In order to exploit the issue of the right of petition, the American Anti-Slavery Society⁷⁵ initiated a nationwide organization for sending petitions to Congress. During the ensuing years this organization deluged Congress with petitions, and diffused antislavery doctrine throughout the North. However, its effect on the state and national antislavery societies was disastrous; for the petitioning organization, once it was in operation, neither needed nor desired centralized direction. The success of the petition campaign thus led directly to the collapse of the antislavery societies.

[G. H. Barnes, *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844*.]

GILBERT HOBBS BARNES

Petroleum Industry. See Oil Industry.

Peyote Cult, THE, is a religious order among many Indian tribes, based on the ceremonial eating of peyote, a small cactus plant which is imported, dried, from Mexico, and which produces trances and color visions. The worship seems to have been brought to the United States by the Kiowas⁷⁶, and from them has spread to other tribes as far north as the Canadian border. Estimates of the number of devotees run as high as 100,000. The cult observes a modified form of Christian worship, consisting of prayers, singing and confession of sins, but is opposed by many missionaries as harmful.

[James Mooney, *The Mescal Plant and Ceremony*; Paul Radin, *Crashing Thunder, the Autobiography of an Indian*.]

PAUL I. WELLMAN

"Phantom Ship," THE. As early as 1644 Theophilus Eaton and other merchants of New Haven Colony⁷⁷ intrusted the construction of a 100-ton, ocean-going vessel to several "feoffees" at New Haven. Though "ill built" and "very walt sided," in due course the vessel was completed. Laden with a cargo of wheat, peas, hides, beaver and plate, and carrying seventy passengers, among whom were several leading merchants of New Haven, and manuscript writings of John Davenport and Thomas Hooker, the vessel sailed for England in January, 1646. On a June evening in 1648 an apparition of the ship appeared over New Haven harbor, but the vessel itself neither reached England nor returned to New Haven. Its loss was a severe blow to the commercial aspirations of the colony.

[For a contemporary account, see John Winthrop, *Journal*, Hosmer edition, Vol. II, pp. 263, 275-276, 286-287, 346. For the traditional story, see Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, London, 1702, Book I, pp. 25-26.]

ISABEL M. CALDER

Phelps-Gorham Purchase, THE (1788), made in April from the legislature of Massachusetts by Oliver Phelps and Nathaniel Gorham, was a tract of land consisting of all western New York beyond a line eighty-two miles west of the intersection of the Delaware River with the boundary of New York and Pennsylvania, and north through Seneca Lake, with the exception of a strip one mile wide running parallel to the Niagara River. The rival claims of New York and Massachusetts to this territory were settled in 1786 by the Treaty of Hartford, which gave the right of first purchase from the Indians (preemption) to Massachusetts and the right of

sovereignty to New York. The purchase price for this tract was settled at £300,000 Massachusetts currency, to be paid in the depreciated consolidated securities of the state. Difficulties soon arose, however, in securing title from the Indians, and despite the fact that Phelps secured the co-operation of Livingston, who had been attempting to secure a 999-year lease for the same territory, and of the Niagara Genesee Company, a Canadian branch company, also interested in the same lands, he was able to persuade the Indians to part with only a third of the land. The rise of the consolidated securities of Massachusetts, with the prospect of Federal assumption of state debts^m, caused further difficulties. Unable to make the payments as agreed, despite a grant of an extension of time, Phelps and Gorham were forced in March, 1790, to surrender to the state the two thirds of their purchase not yet freed from the Indian rights. This reduced their holdings to two townships, for the previous year they had sold the rest of the remaining third to Robert Morris (*see* Pulteney Purchase, The). Even with their returns from this sale, and the privilege of paying the balance of their debt in specie, they found difficulty in meeting their obligations, and the matter dragged on for years before it was settled.

[R. L. Higgins, *Expansion in New York*; A. C. Flick, ed., *History of the State of New York*, Vol. V.]

A. C. FLICK

Phi Beta Kappa Society, founded on Dec. 5, 1776, according to accepted tradition, at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., was the first undergraduate secret society among the colleges of the United States and differed little from other early college societies. The name was taken from the initial letters of its motto, Φιλοσοφία Βίου Κυβερνήτης (Philosophy the guide of life).

It became an honor society with members, both men and women, elected on account of their class standing. The badge of the society is a golden key. The society has now a roster of 132 active chapters and 110 alumni chapters.

WILL D. HOWE

Philadelphia. Boston and New York were half a century old when Philadelphia was founded. Cornelis Jacobsen Mey brought a party of Dutch settlers to the Delaware in 1623, but they located above and below the site of Philadelphia. The New Sweden Company^m, which sent out colonizers in 1638, placed short-lived trading posts at the mouth of the Schuylkill River and had many clashes with the Dutch; but the English took over the whole territory in 1664. More

Swedes had come and settled between the Schuylkill and the Delaware, on the site of central Philadelphia. They built a blockhouse there in 1669 and called their settlement Wicaco. William Penn having obtained his charter in 1681, visited his land in 1682, chose the site of his capital city between the Schuylkill and Delaware, had it surveyed and christened it. By August, 1683, Philadelphia had seventy-five or eighty families, mostly Quaker^m in religion. The first colony of Germans came that year and founded Germantown^m. There were other notable migrations of them in 1694 and 1709. In 1701 Philadelphia became a chartered city. In 1741 the *American Magazine*, the first magazine on the continent, was produced here by Andrew Bradford; and the *Pennsylvania Packet*, founded in 1771, became in 1784 the first daily newspaper in America. In 1752 one of the first American fire insurance companies was organized. The University of Pennsylvania^m was founded here in 1740. The American Philosophical Society^m, founded in 1743, had among its early members Franklin, Rittenhouse, the astronomer, and Godfrey, inventor of the mariner's quadrant. Philadelphia was the chief center of events during the Revolutionary War. The first Continental Congress^m met in the city in 1774, and it continued meeting there through most of the war period. There the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution^m were written. The British under Howe occupied the city from Sept. 26, 1777, to June 18, 1778. Philadelphia was the capital of the nation from 1790 until 1800, and the state capital until 1799. At the beginning of the 19th century it was considered the cultural center of the country, though its eminence in science and philosophy, as attested by numerous societies and institutions for their study, was greater than that in literature. It had developed its old aristocracy, too, centering about Rittenhouse Square in the city proper and in Germantown and Chestnut Hill in the suburbs. It was the largest city in the Union until 1830 and the nation's monetary center until 1836. Yellow fever^m first appeared in 1699, and occurred frequently during the 18th century, raging with dreadful violence between 1793 and 1802; 4000 died in 1793 and 3637 in 1798. The Centennial Exposition^m in 1876 was the first large-scale exhibition in our history. A Sesquicentennial Exposition^m in 1926 was not greatly successful. Philadelphia became a great manufacturing city in the 19th century; but despite its industrialism, its strong infusions of Quaker and German cultures imparted to it a placidity, a conservatism and leisureliness of pace which persist even in

the 20th century and have given it a distinctive character among American cities.

[Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer, *History of Philadelphia*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Philadelphia, Capture and Burning of the.

On Oct. 31, 1803, during the Barbary Wars^o, this frigate, commanded by Capt. William Bainbridge, and temporarily unattended by other American warships blockading Tripoli, sailed too near the shore while pursuing an enemy craft and struck a hidden reef. Heroic efforts to release her proved unavailing, and in the end she and her crew of 307 men were captured. This incident prolonged and made more difficult American negotiations with and operations against Tripoli—although the ill effects were subsequently somewhat minimized in consequence of Stephen Decatur's daring exploit in destroying the captured frigate after the Tripolitans had re-floated her. With some eighty men, in the ketch *Intrepid*, Decatur, during the night of Feb. 16, 1804, boarded the *Philadelphia*, cleared her of the enemy, set her afire and escaped from the harbor.

[H. Adams, *History of the U. S. during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*; G. W. Allen, *Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs*; R. W. Irwin, *Diplomatic Relations of the U. S. with the Barbary Powers*.]

RAY W. IRWIN

Philadelphia & Reading Railroad, THE, was incorporated in 1833. In 1839 its track reached Reading and in 1842 Pottsville, ninety-four miles from Philadelphia. Between 1850 and 1870 it expanded, buying small adjacent lines and building new ones, and by 1865 was dominant in the Schuylkill anthracite field. In 1871 it began buying coal lands of its own, organizing a separate corporation to hold them. In 1903 the Baltimore & Ohio^o and West Shore obtained a controlling interest in the Reading Company, organized in 1898 as a holding corporation for both railroad and coal companies.

[Jules I. Bogen, *The Anthracite Railroads*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Philadelphia Cordwainers' Case (1805) When in the fall of 1805 the journeymen cordwainers of Philadelphia went on strike to enforce their demand for the wage scale prevailing at New York and Baltimore and a discontinuance of the rebate of wages for export work, eight union leaders were arrested on a charge of criminal conspiracy and tried in the Mayor's Court of Philadelphia. The court accepted the arguments of Jared Ingersoll for the prosecution and relied upon British authorities, since refuted, to establish the doctrine that "a conspiracy of workmen

to raise their wages" was criminal at common law. Despite efforts of defense counsel, Cæsar A. Rodney, the defendants were found guilty, but, as the court was chiefly concerned in establishing the principle, they were each fined \$8.00. The strike was broken and an important precedent was set for the criminal prosecution of labor union activities which had multiplied with the rise of wholesale manufacturers. This was the first of six criminal conspiracy cases brought against union shoemakers in this period, four of which were decided against the journeymen.

[W. Nelles, *The First American Labor Case*, *Yale Law Journal*, XLI, Commons and associates, *History of Labor in the United States*, Vol. I.]

RICHARD B. MORRIS

Philadelphia Gas Ring, THE, was a notorious political scandal in the history of American municipal government. The Republican organization in Philadelphia under the leadership of "Boss" James McManes got control of the city's gas department in the late 1860's, employed some 2000 political henchmen therein, charged high rates and gave no service, and pocketed the proceeds. The trustees of the gas department, known as the "Ring," ultimately controlled state as well as city elections. The organization was defeated by a Committee of One Hundred independent citizens who successfully prosecuted members of the "Gas Ring" and roused the electorate to vote for a reform candidate.

[James Bryce, *American Commonwealth; Report on the Philadelphia Gas Ring* by the Committee of One Hundred, November, 1884.]

FRANCES L. REINHOLD

Philadelphia Riots, THE (May 6-8, July 5-8, 1844), climaxed the first phase of American nativistic^o agitation. Both periods of rioting followed minor clashes between Irish Catholics and native political organizations. Disorder quickly spread as Protestants, their antipathies heightened by antipapal propagandists and by a recent Catholic attempt to end Bible reading in the public schools, began systematic attacks on foreigners. During the actual rioting Philadelphia resembled a war-torn city; military companies fought in the streets, cannon were mounted in the public squares, Catholic churches were burned and hundreds of alien homes were sacked by pillaging mobs. A score of persons were killed and nearly 100 wounded before militia ended the mob rule. Public reaction against this violence contributed to the downfall of the American Republican party^o and sent the whole nativistic movement into temporary eclipse.

[Ray A. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade*.]

RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON

Philanthropist, The, was the name of an early antislavery weekly newspaper established by Charles Osborn at Mt. Pleasant, Ohio, in 1817. Benjamin Lundy contributed to it. Osborn sold it in 1818 to Elisha Bates, who continued it three years more as a broadly moral and religious reform advocate, but with little success. The same title was used for an antislavery paper begun at New Richmond, Ohio, in 1834 but removed to Cincinnati in 1836 with James G. Birney as its editor. A mob destroyed the press, but it was printed for a short time in Warren County and delivered to Cincinnati by canal. Gamaliel Bailey, associated with Birney, became sole editor in 1837 and continued it for several years at Cincinnati.

[O. C. Hooper, *History of Ohio Journalism, 1793-1833*.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Philanthropy and Benevolence. Provisions of the Elizabethan Poor Law (1601), making relief of the poor a local problem, were reflected in colonial society. Work was provided for the able-bodied poor. Almshouses were the only public charitable institutions, but special overseers dispensed funds raised by poor rates. Public poor relief was supplemented by church and private charity, and frontier neighborliness cared for most immediate needs. Quakerssm set an example for church care of their own needy. The prosperity of the 18th century, however, produced charity societies in the principal cities, such examples of organized benevolence as the Pennsylvania Hospitalsm (1755) established with public and private co-operation, and notable philanthropists like Dr. Benjamin Rush and Christopher Ludwick.

The Revolution and subsequent humanitarian movements brought new emphasis, and post-Revolutionary urban development presented new problems. Thomas Eddy, Quaker philanthropist, was active in establishing Sunday schools, Bible societies and insane asylums, and in the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders. Stephen Girard, the great financier of the War of 1812, established Girard College for Orphans, to make his riches "do his generous will forever." He also supported the Pennsylvania Hospital, the Society for the Relief of Distressed Masters of Ships and their Widows, the Pennsylvania Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, and other agencies. Home missions, Bible societies, the establishment of colleges, and the support of African colonizationsm were the objects of church benevolence, while private secular charity turned to orphan asylums, hospitals for the insane, and schools for deaf and dumbsm

as in Hartford (1817). Following the Panic of 1837sm organization of Associations for Improving the Conditions of the Poor showed clearly an increase in private charity in poor relief. Charles Loring Brace pioneered with the Children's Aid Society in New York (1852).

The general lines of post-Civil War development appear in Samuel Gridley Howe's direction of the first state Board of Charities in Massachusetts (1865-74), and in his annual reports delineating the work of private charity within the system of public relief. Urban needs brought social settlementssm and a variety of social agencies centering in the Charity Organization Movementsm, all supported liberally by gifts from the newly rich class. Churches gave more generously for Negro education after 1861, Indian missions after 1869, foreign missions after 1890, and to college support and endowment. Churches began to support missions in the slums, social settlements, houses of refuge and welfare lodges. Christian benevolence supported the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A., and gave liberally to the Salvation Armysm for its work among the poor. Church funds of all denominations went to build and support churches in rural areas, and to build orphanages. Fraternal organizationssm also organized orphanages, established homes for the aged, and provided loan and scholarship funds for needy students. George Peabodysm gave millions to public education in the South and then established a foundation to continue his beneficence. The philanthropy of Julius Rosenwald encouraged Negro education.

Colleges and universitiessm were the greatest single beneficiaries of post-Civil War American philanthropy. By 1928 their endowments alone totaled \$1,500,000,000 and they had also received large gifts for operating expense. Few philanthropic foundationssm were established in the 19th century, but they grew rapidly after 1900 especially through the gifts of Andrew Carnegiesm and the Rockefellers, totaling over \$1,000,000,000 by 1930. Colleges and universities were principal beneficiaries of this philanthropy although after 1915 gifts to hospitals, medical education and public health agencies increased rapidly. Community chestssm developed habits of widespread giving, and the per capita annual contribution to social agencies averaged \$2.98 in 1924 and \$3.07 in 1936. The annual cost of operating these agencies was estimated at \$750,000,000 by William J. Norton in 1923. Individual private benevolence and church contributions were not included.

American benevolence tended, after 1900, to become worldwide in scope. The Rockefeller

Foundation⁷⁷ encouraged improvement in health and sanitation throughout Latin America, Carnegie wealth sponsored peace programs, international education and intellectual co-operation. The Belgian Relief Commission, Near East Relief, American Relief Administration⁷⁸, and other related agencies under the direction of Herbert Hoover, disbursed \$375,000,000 provided by American gifts, besides the gifts and liberal credit of the United States Government, for food and clothing in Belgium, France, Central Europe, Russia and the Near East between 1914 and 1924. The Friends Service Committee, and Jewish and Catholic agencies contributed generously; and the American Red Cross⁷⁹ spent over \$120,000,000 for European relief during these years. The Red Cross has also expended nearly \$100,000,000 since 1881 for disaster relief at home and abroad, including: the San Francisco earthquake (1906)⁸⁰, Chinese floods and famines (1920-21 and 1931-32), Mississippi and Ohio River floods⁸¹, Japanese earthquake (1923), the United States drought (1930-31), Chilean earthquake (1938).

American charity has followed in general the basic principles of Elizabethan and Victorian poor relief: closely restricted public charity with chief reliance on private charity. After the Civil War, and especially after 1900, philanthropy was stimulated by prosperity, by tax exemption of "charitable" and "benevolent" institutions, and exemption for charitable gifts under income and inheritance tax laws. Carnegie's philosophy of the "stewardship of wealth" pointed the way to those of wealth, and community chests gave a broad basis to an American habit of philanthropy. Although public welfare activities have increased since 1932 to the place where expenditures exceed the volume of private philanthropy, the latter has revived to a large extent. Since 1936 American benevolence has been frequently enlisted to relieve the war suffering in China and in Europe.

[E. Abbott, *Some American Pioneers in Social Welfare*; A. Johnson, *Adventures in Social Welfare*; W. I. King, *Trends in Philanthropy*; A. G. Warner, *American Charities*.]

HAROLD E. DAVIS

Philippi, The Skirmish at (June 3, 1861), was probably the first field action of the Civil War. A Confederate force of about 1000 under Col. G. A. Porterfield, which had been burning railroad bridges in West Virginia, was surprised and routed at Philippi on a stormy night by Col. B. F. Kelley with a Federal command of 3000. The casualties were few.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. I.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Philippine Independence. The movement to give freedom to the Philippines⁸² began in this country immediately after the annexation of the islands, and was the product of anti-imperialistic tradition and Democratic opposition to Republican expansionist policies. The Democratic party under William Jennings Bryan advocated independence in the presidential campaign of 1900. In 1916 the Jones Act⁸³ announced the policy of granting independence as soon as a stable form of government should be established. By about 1930 the friends of Philippine independence in the United States had been joined by the representatives of several important interests, including the producers of sugar, butter and cottonseed oil. Officials of organized labor and congressional delegations from Pacific coast states also supported the movement. Lobbyists complained that so long as the Philippines were annexed to the United States, Philippine products, such as sugar and coconut oil, would be imported without duty and that the immigration of Filipinos could not be stopped. In 1934 Congress passed the Tydings-McDuffie Act⁸⁴ providing for independence after a period of ten years under a commonwealth government. This law was accepted by the Philippine legislature. It stipulated that a constitution should be drafted for the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands. The constitution was drafted in 1935 and was accepted by President F. D. Roosevelt. The commonwealth government was inaugurated in November, 1935. During the ten-year commonwealth period a United States High Commissioner resides at Manila. The United States retains power over foreign loans, foreign relations and some other matters. American imports are admitted free into the Philippines; but Philippine exports to the United States are restricted by quotas and, from the sixth to the tenth year, are subject to annually increasing export taxes. On July 4, 1946, the Philippine Islands, according to the act, will receive their independence.

[Grayson L. Kirk, *Philippine Independence, Motives, Problems, and Prospects*.]

BENJAMIN H. WILLIAMS

Philippine Insurrection, THE (1899-1902). Cession of the Philippine Islands⁸⁵ to the United States by Spain in 1898 disappointed native expectations of immediate independence. Filipino insurgents already in arms against Spain proclaimed a republic, and friction between them and American authorities culminated on Feb. 4, 1899, in open hostilities. Regular and volunteer troops under Generals Anderson, Merritt, McArthur, Otis, Wheaton and Lawton defeated the *insurrectos*, driving them into north-

ern Luzon. The Filipino "capital," Malolos, fell on March 31, the native government under Emilio Aguinaldo withdrawing to Tarlac. Sharp fighting with organized troops occurred along the Manila Railway and at successive entrenched river positions. Tarlac was taken in November, the insurgent armies then disintegrating. Aguinaldo fled to inaccessible northeastern Luzon.

Guerrilla warfare ensued throughout the archipelago until suppressed in April, 1902, when the last important chieftain surrendered. Aguinaldo was captured by stratagem in March, 1901 (see Funston's Capture of Aguinaldo).

More than 120,000 American soldiers were engaged in the war, a maximum of 69,000 at any one period. Barbarities practised by the Filipino guerrillas, especially against their own people, necessitated stern retaliatory measures. In Samar, an entire company of American regulars was surprised and massacred. The principal insurgent leaders were Aguinaldo and Gregorio del Pilar (Tagalogs), Antonio Luna (Ilocano), and Vicente Luchan (Visayan). Their troops, undisciplined, ill-armed and without artillery, were easily defeated, but with great difficulty dispersed. Generally speaking, the Filipino people supported the insurrection, although little effective co-operation was evident between tribes or islands. The Mindanao and Jolo Moros held aloof, to be subjugated later.

[Jas. A. LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*; Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines, Past and Present*, Chas. B. Elliott, *The Philippines, To the End of the Military Regime*.]

CHARLES WINSLOW ELLIOTT

Philippine Islands, THE (over 7000 in number, of which over 1000 are habitable), were discovered by Magellan in 1521. Spanish occupation, under Miguel López de Legazpi, dates from 1565, and was continuous (except for the partial occupation by the British, 1762-64) until 1898, when by virtue of the outcome of the Spanish-American War²⁰ the islands became a possession of the United States.

The greatest single result of the Spanish occupation was the establishment of Christianity among the eight principal peoples (who became the Filipinos proper) and the consequent inculcation to some degree of western ideas. The rising tide of Mohammedanism was restricted, after Spanish occupation, to Mindanao and adjacent regions, where that cult still remains. The great result of the occupation by the United States has been the development along educational, agricultural, commercial, sanitary and material lines in general, together with the rise of free democratic institutions. To the Filipinos, the American regime ushered in a period of agi-

tation for political independence which finally resulted in the formation of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, with promise of complete independence on July 4, 1946.

Cession of the islands was made by the Treaty of Paris²¹ (ratified Dec. 10, 1898). A later treaty (ratified Nov. 7, 1900) ceded other outlying islands not included in the first treaty. Almost the first result of the transfer of the islands was the insurrection of the Filipinos (who had been in revolt against Spain). Costly military operations succeeded. As regions were pacified, civil government was established under military officers. The educational program was immediately inaugurated with soldiers as teachers, but soon trained teachers were sent from the United States. Real civil government was established by William Howard Taft, the first civil governor (a title changed to that of governor general under his successor, Luke E. Wright), who, acting under directions, inaugurated the Philippine Commission as a unicameral legislative body. Under Taft's successors, the program as outlined by McKinley, Root and Taft was carried on, special emphasis being given to education, health, agriculture, construction of roads and bridges, commerce and trade, and public order. In line with Taft's pronouncement, "The Philippines for the Filipinos," the Philippine Assembly was inaugurated by the United States on Aug. 16, 1907. This, more than ever, gave rise to the independence campaign (often unbridled) waged by the Filipinos.

In 1913 American partisan politics, very largely absent thitherto in the administration of the islands, became a factor of importance through the appointment by President Wilson of a Tammany politician as governor general. By the President's directions, too ideal at that time, the Filipinos were given a majority of one on the Philippine Commission, thus giving them control of both houses. Francis Burton Harrison's administration (1913-21) is known as the era of good feeling because he very largely delegated his powers to the Filipinos.

A new enabling act, known as the Jones Bill²², passed Congress and was put in force Aug. 29, 1916, by virtue of which an elective senate and house of representatives were created and the old Philippine Commission and Philippine Assembly abolished. By consent of the governor general, a council of state consisting of Filipino officials was created with advisory and certain political powers; but in 1923, under Governor General Leonard Wood, it ceased to function until recreated solely as an advisory body, by Governor General Stimson in 1928.

The administration of Leonard Wood, who succeeded Harrison as governor general in 1921, was stormy, for much of his effort was expended in an attempt to regain the lost authority of his office. The tide, however, could not be stemmed entirely, as the Filipinos were naturally loath to surrender power once enjoyed; and they had little liking for Wood's military manner. Both President Coolidge and President Hoover were conservative and refused to entertain the idea of granting immediate independence to the islands. This condition, however, was quite changed in the succeeding presidential administration, and the Tydings-McDuffie Bill¹ provided for an autonomous Commonwealth of the Philippines for a period of ten years, after which an independent republic should be instituted. Conditions outlined in the bill having been fulfilled and an approved constitution adopted, the date for the grant of complete independence was set for July 4, 1946.

Manuel Quezon, a Tagalog mestizo, and for many years in charge of the independence campaign, was elected president of the commonwealth, and has, on the whole, acted with restraint, although for a time he tried to advance the date for independence. Governor General Frank Murphy, in accordance with provisions of the Tydings-McDuffie Bill, was appointed resident commissioner (1935), and on his resignation from that post, Paul V. McNutt was appointed.

An attempt has been made, with some success, to revise the unfavorable economic provisions of the Tydings-McDuffie Bill. An extension of the trade relations existing between the United States and the Philippines was granted for fifteen years after July 4, 1946. Fear of Japanese aggression gave pause to Filipino desire for a complete severance of ties with the United States, and there has been talk in the islands of some sort of a protectorate. Except for the scuttling economic policy provided by the independence act, some shortsightedness arising from impractical ideals, and some natural errors in administration, the role of the United States in the Philippines has not been without honor.

[Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*; W. Cameron Forbes, *The Philippine Islands*; Grayson Kirk, *Philippine Independence*; James A. LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*; Dean C. Worcester, *The Philippines, Past and Present*.]

JAMES A. ROBERTSON

Philipse's Patent, an enormous tract in Putnam County, N. Y., was purchased by Adolphe Philipse from Lambert Dorlandt and Jan Sybrant, who had obtained a license to buy it from the Indians. In 1697 Philipse secured a patent

from Gov. Fletcher for this tract and some additional land, which was known as Philipse's Highland patent. Both the Highland patent and the manor of Philipsborough in Westchester were inherited by Frederick Philipse, who on his death divided the Highland patent among his four younger children.

[William Pelletreau, *History of Putnam County*.]

A. C. FLICK

Philosophical Thought and Writings. Our colonial period was dominated by the Calvinistic philosophy of Puritan New England. Its leaders, John Winthrop and John Cotton, sought a pure religion through a theocracy, earliest set forth in *A Model of Church and Civil Power* (1634). Roger Williams (*The Bloody Tenent of Persecution*, 1644) sought the same end through the separation of church and state². In introducing Berkeley's idealism, Samuel Johnson (*Elementa Philosophica*, 1752) was handicapped by his Anglicanism. In Jonathan Edwards (*Freedom of Will*, 1754) Puritanism, though aided by the emotional techniques of the Great Awakening, made its last stand against the rising tide of Deism³. Calvinism⁴ had been pessimistic, regulatory and theocratic; Deism was optimistic, free and democratic. Being more suitable to frontier conditions, this belief in natural rights laid the philosophical basis for the American Revolution. Benjamin Franklin, though retaining the Puritan virtues of thrift, enterprise and discipline, emphasized the importance of natural law in everything, and completed the transition to the Age of Reason. Ethan Allen (*Reason the Only Oracle of Man*, 1784) and Thomas Paine (*Common Sense*⁵, 1776; *The Rights of Man*⁶, 1791) both influenced the revolutionary trend and provided its philosophical justification. Virginia, however, was the true home of equalitarian theory and Jefferson its typical representative. His political battle with Hamilton found echo in the philosophical contest of John Taylor of Caroline (*An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States*, 1814) and John Adams (*Defense of the Constitutions of Government of the United States*, 1787). W. E. Channing and the Unitarians⁷ owed much to the deistic influence, and Thomas Cooper in Charleston went on to a materialistic position. As exemplified by Benjamin Rush of Philadelphia and the Scottish realists, John Witherspoon and S. S. Smith of Princeton, the Middle States took a middle ground between the reason of the South and the religion of New England.

In the mid-19th century, the rise of Transcendentalism⁸ with Emerson (*Essays*, 1841;

1844) as its expositor, reflected the triumph of Jacksonian nationalism and Western democracy. Individualistic, optimistic, idealistic and mystical, it was distinctly of its time. But its time was cut short by an advancing industrialism whose philosophical consideration was distracted by a spectacular conflict over evolutionary theory. John Fiske (*Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy*, 1874), endeavoring to reconcile Darwin^m and Spencer with religion, won them popular acceptance. W. T. Harris essayed the introduction of Hegelian idealism, and Josiah Royce's idealism emphasized the need of religious values in an increasingly materialistic civilization. Meanwhile, C. S. Peirce formulated and William James (*Pragmatism*, 1907), through evolutionary biology and psychology, developed the most distinctively American philosophy—Pragmatism.

Philosophy, when applied, has often been distorted. For example, such doctrines as Calvinistic election, Jeffersonian natural rights, Emersonian individualism, evolutionary survival and pragmatic sanction have all been used to justify any American economic success. But if the keynote of philosophy in the 17th century was theological; in the 18th, rational; in the 19th, scientific—in the 20th, perhaps, it bids fair to be social.

[P. R. Anderson and M. H. Fisch, *Philosophy in America*; I. Woodbridge Riley, *American Thought*; Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought*.]

HARVEY L. CARTER

Phoenix, THE, was the first important, entirely American-built steamship, and the second successfully engaged in the transportation of passengers and freight. Designed by John Stevens, of Hoboken, N. J., in 1806, launched April 9, 1808, she was intended for service between New Brunswick, N. J., and New York, but the monopoly held by Fulton and Livingston prevented the vessel entering waters subject to jurisdiction of New York State (see "Fulton's Folly"). Stevens sent her by sea to the Delaware to run between Philadelphia and Trenton. Leaving New York, June 8, 1809, the *Phoenix* reached Philadelphia, June 17, the first steamship to venture upon the open sea.

[J. H. Morrison, *History of American Steam Navigation*.]

STANLEY R. PILLSBURY

Phoenix Riot, THE (Nov. 8–10, 1898), in Greenwood County, S. C., resulted from the attempt of Negroes to defy the disfranchising provisions of the state constitution of 1895. A white election official was killed by Negroes when he prevented their voting at an unofficial ballot box provided by R. R. Tolbert, a member of a noted Scalawag^m family. Resentful whites, crying "Col-

or and Country," captured fifteen terrified blacks, four of whom were shot after trial under lynch law. During the subsequent reign of terror two or three other blacks were killed and the Tolberts were forced to flee. This disturbance proved that white South Carolina could effectively invoke violence to keep the Negroes disfranchised and that thereafter fewer and fewer of them would manifest political ambitions.

[D. D. Wallace, *The History of South Carolina*, Vol. III.]

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS

Phoenixiana (1855) was the work of George Horatio Derby (1823–61), an officer in the U. S. Topographical Engineers, writing under the pseudonym John Phoenix. The volume comprises some thirty short humorous sketches and burlesques of current happenings, which had appeared in California newspapers and magazines between 1850 and 1855. It was immediately successful, and remained popular for a generation; twenty-nine editions or reprintings have been noted. In addition to being notable as an early example of "American" humor, *Phoenixiana* offers to the general historian a commentary, at once humorous and intelligent, upon the political and social conditions of the time, particularly of California.

[G. R. Stewart, *John Phoenix, Esq.*]

GEORGE R. STEWART

Phonograph, THE. Groping experiments, beginning as early as 1807, had presaged the invention of the phonograph. The first practical instrument was patented by Thomas A. Edison in January, 1877. It created a great sensation. The Pennsylvania Railroad ran special trains to Menlo Park, N. J., where Edison was exhibiting it. President Hayes asked him to bring it to the White House, and listened to it until 3:30 in the morning. But the machine was too expensive for most American families, and did not avail the public greatly for some fifteen years. In 1888 Emil Berliner, a Bell Telephone scientist, produced the gramophone, which used discs, whereas the Edison machine used cylinders. The Edison Company several years later changed to discs. After 1890, in public places, phonographs began to appear which, at the dropping of a coin (at first a nickel, later a cent), would reproduce music or speeches. This greatly stimulated the use of the machine. The reproduction of Bryan's famous "free silver" speech of acceptance at the Chicago Democratic Convention in 1896, the most famous record of its time, was heard in every hamlet of the land. Through the phonograph, many who had been strangers to

good music were now introduced to it, and others who had craved it in vain were now able to enjoy it.

[Frank Lewis Dyer and Thomas Commerford Martin, *Edison: His Life and Inventions.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Phosphate Industry, THE, in South Carolina dates from 1867, when phosphate nodules were discovered along the Ashley River near Charleston, although the existence of phosphatic stone in the state was recognized as early as 1837. The extensive deposits, which were located principally along the coast both on land and under water, were immediately utilized by companies formed either locally or with the aid of Northern capital. Up to 1890 South Carolina produced annually about 90% of the world's supply of phosphate rock, and the industry, which was one of the largest and most profitable in the state, was a vital factor in reviving the shattered economic life resulting from the Civil War. But the policy pursued by the state government, especially with regard to the companies engaged in river mining, was uncertain and indefinite; and following 1890, the doubling of the royalty exacted from the producers and the forcing of new corporate relations by Gov. Tillman, together with competition from the great Florida and Tennessee fields, which yield a rock of higher grade and much less expensive to mine, gradually drove the South Carolina product from the market and necessitated the abandonment of mining operations.

The industry has retained its importance in Florida and Tennessee. Idaho ranks third among the states in the production of phosphate rock, but with this exception the vast beds of the Far West have not been extensively utilized.

[Francis S. Holmes, *Phosphate Rocks of South Carolina*; Philip E. Chazal, *Sketch of the South Carolina Phosphate Industry.*]

JAMES W. PATTON

Photography in this country has been practised since 1839, following immediately after publication of processes discovered abroad. Daguerre's process (photographs on silver-plated copper, called daguerreotypes[™]) was first adopted professionally in this country and was used almost solely until the middle 1850's. The collodion, or wet, process announced by the Englishman Archer in 1851 was only slowly adopted, but by 1854 leading American professionals had begun its practice. A modification, patented by James A. Cutting of Boston, known as the ambrotype (a photograph on glass), met with great popularity in 1856 and 1857. As a result, daguerreotypy was displaced and the wet process

in some of its various modifications—card and cabinet photographs, tintypes[™] and stereographs—was largely practised in this country until 1881. Card photographs, measuring about $2\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4", and the family album to contain them, were introduced in this country in 1859. The cabinet photograph, mounted on a card $4\frac{1}{4}$ " x $6\frac{1}{2}$ ", followed in 1866 and became well known for portrait work. The stereograph, which, together with the stereoscope, was almost as popular an institution in the American family home as the album, was introduced by the Langenheim Brothers of Philadelphia in the middle 1850's, but achieved its greatest popularity in the several decades following the Civil War.

Notable achievements of American photographers in wet-plate days include (1) the recording of the Civil War by Mathew B. Brady[™] and Alexander Gardner, both of whom employed a large staff of photographers; (2) the recording of the trans-Mississippi frontier and of the transcontinental railroads while under construction; (3) attempts to reproduce the illusion of motion by photography, first begun by Coleman Sellers of Philadelphia in 1861 and continued by Henry R. Heyl of Philadelphia and Eadweard Muybridge of California, finally resulting in the motion picture[™]; (4) efforts to reproduce illustrations in facsimile for books, magazines and newspapers, begun in the 1850's and culminating eventually in the half-tone process.

Modern gelatin dry plates were first manufactured in this country in 1878, but they were very slowly adopted by professionals. The tremendous interest in amateur photography arose after the invention of the Kodak, patented by George Eastman in 1888, and the production of a flexible transparent film, patent applied for by Hannibal Goodwin in 1887. As a result of these two factors and their subsequent development, it has been estimated (1937) that there were in this country some 15,000,000 amateur photographers.

[Beaumont Newhall, *Photography, 1839-1937*; Robert Taft, *Photography and the American Scene.*]

ROBERT TAFT

Piankashaw Indians, THE, were a minor tribe, closely associated with the Miami[™], the Wea and the Peoria. The early French explorers encountered them in northern Illinois and in adjacent parts of Indiana; somewhat later they were located on the lower Wabash. Successive removals in the 19th century finally brought them to Oklahoma, where the survivors number but a handful.

[F. W. Hodge, ed., *Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico.*]

M. M. QUARRE

Piave River, Operations on (October–November, 1918). During October, the 332d Infantry Regiment, detached from the American 83d Division, made frequent marches, principally for their effect upon Italian morale, in rear of the Piave River battle front. On Oct. 27–28, the regiment assisted Italian forces in establishing bridgeheads on the Piave River and, on Oct. 30, as part of the Italian 31st Division, it joined in the operation which drove the Austrian forces from the Piave to the Tagliamento River^m.

[*Order of Battle of the United States Land Forces in the World War, A. E. F—Divisions*, War Department Document No. 23a, June 30, 1931, printed by the Government Printing Office; Official records of the A. E. F. on file in the War Department]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Pickawillany, an Indian village near the site of the present Piqua, Ohio, was the western outpost of English traders before the French and Indian War^m. It was founded about 1748 by Miami^m who left their village at the site of Fort Wayne, Ind., desiring British rather than French trade. In 1749, when Céloron's expedition^m reached Pickawillany, Céloron ejected two employes of English traders and urged the Miami to return to their old village. He was, however, answered evasively by the chief LaDemoiselle, or "Old Britain," as the English called him. By 1750 English traders had built storehouses at Pickawillany and several were in residence there. Early in 1751 Christopher Gist^m reported that the village consisted of about 400 families and was "daily encreasing." George Croghan, Gist's companion, was so successful in cementing the friendship of the Miami that they refused to return to their old home at the request of a party of "French Indians"

Later in 1751 Gov. Jonquiere sent to Pickawillany a party of eastern Indians under Bellestre and Longueuil to eject the English traders by force if necessary. Though the Ottawa^m forbade its passage through their territory, a small group reached Pickawillany, took some scalps, and increased the Miami's hostility to the French. Longueuil, Jonquiere's successor, feared a general revolt of the Indians with LaDemoiselle as a leading spirit. Finally, on June 21, 1752, Charles de Langlade and over 200 Ottawa attacked Pickawillany, destroyed the traders' storehouses and confiscated goods worth £3000. Five English traders were captured and sent to France; several Miami, including LaDemoiselle, were killed; and the chief was cooked and eaten. After the treaty of Logstown^m Capt. Trent met some of the fleeing Miami and gave them their share of the royal present; but the English influ-

ence among them waned, and they returned to their old village, leaving Pickawillany deserted.

[L. P. Kellogg, *French Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest*; C. A. Hanna, *Wilderness Trail*.]

SOLOMON J. BUCK

Pickens, Fort. Upon the secession of Florida (Jan. 10, 1861) and the Confederate seizure of forts on the mainland at Pensacola, Lt. Adam J. Slemmer, with forty loyal Union troopers, escaped across the bay to Santa Rosa Island^m and took possession of the long unoccupied Fort Pickens. Short of food and ammunition, Slemmer's handful of men found themselves in April, 1861, in precisely the same situation as Maj. Anderson's men at Fort Sumter^m. Fortunately for the Union cause, a relief expedition, secretly organized by Secretary of State Seward (*see Powhatan Incident*), and energetically carried out by Capt. Montgomery C. Meigs and Lt. David D. Porter, reinforced Fort Pickens and saved it from the fate which overtook Fort Sumter. Fort Pickens remained an important Federal stronghold throughout the war.

[*Official Records . . . Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. 4; R. S. West, Jr., *The Second Admiral*.]

RICHARD S. WEST, JR.

Picketing usually accompanies strikes^m when unions consider it advantageous to prevent an employer from obtaining labor with which to continue operations. Concerted action by the strikers runs all the way from attempts at persuasion to violence, threatened or actual, against those refusing to participate in the strike. The practice is as old as the strike; the Cordwainers (*see Philadelphia Cordwainers' Case*) and other unions in the early 19th century hounded the scab. The Journeymen Tailors' Society of Philadelphia was penalized for picketing in 1827, and down to the present time picketing has presented a knotty legal problem. Accompanying the development of labor organizations and widespread strike activity after 1870, the picketing issue came before various state and Federal courts. Prior to 1921 the legal status of picketing was altogether unclear; while on the whole persuasion was considered lawful, and intimidation unlawful, no legal agreement existed. Three states forbade all picketing by statute; one Federal court in 1905 ruled that peaceful picketing was virtually a contradiction in terms, yet in other jurisdictions the doctrine prevailed that picketing might be peaceful and hence lawful.

Two Supreme Court decisions which somewhat clarified the legal situation were delivered after 1920. In the American Steel Foundries Case (1921) the Court attempted to define peaceful

picketing and took the view that the legality of efforts of strikers to persuade other workers depended upon the facts in each case. Some such interpretation has subsequently guided courts in ruling on picketing problems. In *Truax v. Corrigan*⁷⁷ (1921) an Arizona statute which appeared to legalize mass picketing was found unconstitutional. Since 1921 the general view has been that picketing is not of itself unlawful. In 1937 in the case of *Senn v. Tile Layers Protective Union*, the Supreme Court upheld a Wisconsin statute, substantially similar to the Federal Norris-LaGuardia Act⁷⁸, under which the Wisconsin supreme court had maintained the legality of the action of a union in picketing the premises of an employer in whose shop the union had no members. In 1938 in *Lauf v. E. G. Shimer*, a similar case, the Supreme Court upheld the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Other state cases legalize secondary peaceful picketing. Apparently, also, the National Labor Relations Act of 1935⁷⁹ has extended the right of persuasion. Hence, the legality of picketing, within limitations upon numbers involved, the degree of intimidation, the means utilized, etc., is fairly well established. However, subsequent to 1937 a few states have enacted legislation sharply regulating and restricting the conduct of picketing.

[A. G. Taylor, *Labor Problems and Labor Law*; J. R. Commons and J. B. Andrews, *Principles of Labor Legislation*; J. R. Commons and associates, *History of Labor in the U. S.*; U. S. Labor Information Bulletin, September, 1939; Proc. Am. Fed. of Labor, 1939, pp. 298 ff.]

HERBERT MAYNARD DIAMOND

Pickett's Charge (July 3, 1863), more properly the Pickett-Pettigrew charge, was the culminating event of the battle of Gettysburg⁸⁰. Having failed on July 1 and 2 to drive the Federals, Gen. Lee decided to assault their center. For this purpose he designated Pickett's division, the division of Harry Heth, temporarily commanded by J. J. Pettigrew, and two brigades of Pender's division. After a preliminary bombardment by 125 guns, these troops, 47 regiments, 15,000 men, were ordered to advance an average of 1300 yards eastward from Seminary Ridge to a "little clump of trees" on the front of the II Corps along Cemetery Ridge. The assault, delivered with the utmost gallantry after 2 P.M., carried the column of attack to the Federal position, but failed for lack of support when the Federals closed in from three sides. The Confederates, who were compelled to retreat under heavy fire, lost about 6000 men. Three of Pickett's brigade commanders and most of his field officers were killed.

[D. S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee*, Vol. III.]

DOUGLAS SOUTHALL FREEMAN

Picture Writing, Indian, is a term loosely applied to all Indian pictures. In the United States many prehistoric pictographs, found upon rocks, may be symbolic but not necessarily intended for writing. Yet the historic Indians made some use of picture writing to convey information. In 1823 the traveler West, in the Red River country, noted his guide making pictures upon a piece of wood to be left on the trail as a message, indicating the number of persons in West's party, the direction taken and instructions to follow. The Plains Indians recorded their deeds upon buffalo robes and upon the covers of tipis in a similar manner, but a full understanding of such pictures was scarcely possible without help from their authors. The Kiowa and Dakota⁸¹ tribes kept crude calendars, each year indicated by some unique event: as in our year 1828 a man by the name of Chadron built a house at Cheyenne River; it was represented by the outline of a white man's house, encasing the head and shoulders of a man wearing a hat. In such cases it is obvious that the form of picture writing is little more than a mnemonic system. After contact with white people Indians often signed their names by a graph, for example, as in a petition of Pennsylvania Indians to the English king, 1701. However, in this case the names of Indians are written in English but accompanied by Indian symbols called "totems," representing their respective hereditary families or clans.

About 1880 the followers of Red Cloud at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., petitioned their agent to recognize him as a chief; their names were in picture writing, 289 in all. In most cases the signer's name was indicated by drawing the profile of a face and above it a symbol; for example, a horse painted yellow=Yellow Horse. The nearest approach to true writing among United States Indians appears in the song records of the Ojibwa⁸², made by pressing the point of a stylus upon strips of birch bark.

[W. J. Hoffman, *The Beginnings of Writing*.]

CLARK WISSLER

Piece Work is one of the oldest methods of paying for labor. It was known among ancient peoples, the payment often being in the form of food, the amount given depending upon the amount of work accomplished. In England it was in general use before the industrial revolution.

Piece work was common in American industry almost from the first, the amount of work assigned being called a stint or a "stent." It was the only form of incentive wage plan until the rise of industrial management⁸³ brought the premium differential and task-and-bonus plans

into widespread use. The principle upon which all these incentive plans is based is payment for results.

A variation of piece work which was in use in American industry during the last half of the 19th century was known as "contract work." Andrew Carnegie, writing of his native Scottish village in the 1840's, refers to the practice in weaving where the weavers owned their looms, got warps from large manufacturers, and were paid piece rates for weaving the cloth. In America this method was applied to many kinds of production including machinery and tools; the one taking the contract to produce a certain amount of finished product for a specified price was called the "contractor." During the depression of 1930-36 this method was revived in some branches of the textile industry, notably silk weaving.

L. P. ALFORD

Pieces of Eight were Spanish silver coins of eight *reales* ("eight bits"), first authorized by a law of 1497. Also known as *pesos* and Spanish dollars, they were minted in enormous quantities and soon became recognized and accepted throughout the commercial world as a reliable medium of exchange. In 1728 the Spaniards began coinage of the milled dollar to replace the old piece of eight, the new coins being more difficult to "clip" or "shave" than the old ones. Subsidiary coins of four *reales* ("Half dollar"; "four bits"), two *reales* ("quarter dollar"; "two bits"), etc., were also minted. The Spanish piece of eight or milled dollar had become familiar as the metallic basis of the monetary system in the British colonies in America, and consequently Congress adopted the Spanish milled dollar in 1786 as the basis of the coinage system^o of the United States, the first American dollars^o containing approximately the same amount of silver as their contemporary Spanish counterparts.

[D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*; J. P. Young, *Central American Currency and Finance*; J. B. McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*; Edward Channing, *History of the United States*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Piedmont Region, THE, is geographically the area of the eastern United States lying at the foot of the easternmost ranges of the mountains of the Appalachian system, but, historically considered, is all the territory included between these ranges and the fall line^o on the rivers. Below these falls many of the rivers are tidal estuaries and the region is known as Tidewater^o. Upcountry or back country^o is other terminology sometimes given to the Piedmont region. The division of the Atlantic coastal plain into these

two regions has been profoundly important in American history. First settled, the Tidewater region became the locale of conservative planters, merchants and politicians. To the Piedmont region went later, and often less wealthy and cultured, settlers. There they became small farmers rather than great planters or merchants. Socially and economically democratic, Piedmonters were generally at odds with the Tidewater population. Early sectionalism^o in America was based mainly on this differentiation. The gradual elimination of political discrimination and improved transportation have decreased but not eliminated the sectional significance of the Piedmont region.

[Charles Henry Ambler, *Sectionalism in Virginia*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Piegans, War and Treaty with the (1855-70). By a treaty in 1855 Gen. I. I. Stevens fixed the hunting grounds of the Blackfoot^o confederacy, the Blackfeet, Bloods and Piegans, north of the Missouri River in Montana. Invasion of this territory by miners and ranchers in 1869 caused retaliatory raids by the Piegans who killed settlers near Fort Benton^o.

Col. E. M. Baker marched against the Indians Jan. 6, 1870, striking Chief Red Horn's camp on the Marias River Jan. 23. Suffering from smallpox, the Indians were completely surprised and Baker's detachment killed 173, including many women and children, with a loss of only one soldier. Red Horn was among the slain. The incident drew censure from Congress and the press, but the Piegans never again caused trouble.

[J. P. Dunn, *Massacres of the Mountains*.]

PAUL I. WELLMAN

Pierre, Fort, developed from a small trading post established by Joseph LaFramboise, at the mouth of the Bad River on the west bank of the Missouri in October, 1817. The Columbia Fur Company^o took the business over in 1822 and named the post Fort Tecumseh. In 1828 the Astor interests bought the plant and in 1832 built a new post and named it Fort Pierre Chouteau. The Chouteau appellation did not become popular and was dropped. In 1855 the Government bought the plant, but dismantled it a year later. The village of Fort Pierre now occupies the area. For several decades Fort Pierre was the only place indicated on the maps of the Dakota country. There in 1743 the Verendrye^o brothers made claim to the Northwest for France and planted an inscribed plate in testimony to the taking. This plate was recovered in 1913.

[Old Fort Pierre and Its Neighbors, in *So. Dak. Historical Collections*, 1902.]

DOANE ROBINSON

Pierre's Hole, The Battle of, was fought at the scene of this noted trappers' rendezvous⁷⁰ in the Teton Mountains (in present eastern Idaho) between Gros Ventres Indians⁷¹ and American fur traders July 18, 1832. It was the most renowned struggle of the trapping era, and witnessed the exploits of such prominent trappers and pathfinders as William L. Sublette, Nathaniel J. Wyeth and Antoine Godin. The whites surrounded their outnumbered enemy in a fort protected by brush, but after an all-day fight were unable to dislodge them. During a parley the interpreter for the whites wrongly announced that more Blackfeet were at their camp and the attack was abandoned.

[H. M. Chittenden, *History of the Fur Trade of the Far West*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Pietism is the name given to the movement in German Protestantism which arose in the 17th and 18th centuries to combat the growing formalism in the Lutheran and Reformed churches. The father of the movement was Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705), a Lutheran minister in Frankfort-on-Main, who began the formation of *Collegia Pietatis* or societies of piety for the promotion of Bible study and prayer. He stressed Christianity as a life rather than as a creed; lay people were urged to take a larger part in the work of the church. In 1694 the University of Halle was established through Spener's influence, and became the principal pietistic center. Spener's work was continued by August Herman Francke (1663-1727) at Halle and pietism spread throughout Germany, influenced John Wesley and the Methodist movement in England and swept into the Scandinavian countries. In the American colonies its influence was chiefly exerted through the German Lutherans, the German Reformed and the Moravians⁷². Henry M. Muhlenberg was sent to America largely through the exertions of the Halle pietists and his leadership among the colonial Lutherans⁷³ in the formative period served to emphasize that phase of Lutheranism. Count Zinzendorf was a pietist, having spent six years at Halle, and the American Moravians were the most pietistic of all the colonial religious bodies. Pietism was from the beginning strongly missionary in emphasis, and for that reason had large significance in colonial America particularly.

[C. H. Maxson, *The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies*; A. W. Nagler, *Pietism and Methodism*; Henry E. Jacobs, *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

"Pig War." See San Juan, Seizure of (July, 1859).

Pike's Expedition to the Upper Mississippi (1805-6). The acquisition of Louisiana⁷⁴ initiated a notable period of western exploration in which Lt. Zebulon M. Pike played a leading role. On Aug. 9, 1805, he left St. Louis with twenty soldiers on a 70-foot keelboat⁷⁵ to explore the Mississippi to its source, conciliate the natives, assert the authority of the United States, and procure sites for military posts. Near Little Falls, Minn., Pike built a substantial log fort, after which he traveled for weeks in midwinter by sled and toboggan, ascending to the upper reaches of the Mississippi, replacing the British flag with the American, hobnobbing with the natives and making geographical observations. He reached St. Louis, April 30, 1806, with a record of achievement which won the appointment to lead an expedition to the far Southwest (see Pike's Southwestern Expedition). Although he had accomplished all that had been expected of him, the Government neglected to follow up his achievement, whose chief practical result was its addition to existing geographical knowledge.

[W. W. Folwell, *History of Minnesota*, Vol. I; Coues, ed., *Expeditions of Zebulon Montgomery Pike . . . to Headwaters of the Mississippi River . . .*]

M. M. QUAIFFE

Pikes Peak (altitude 14,110 feet), the most famous of the Colorado mountains, was first described by Zebulon M. Pike in his *Journal*, Nov. 25-27, 1806 (see Pike's Southwestern Expedition); first ascended by Dr. Edwin James, July 14, 1820; named James Peak by Maj. Long⁷⁶, but became officially Pikes Peak through popular usage by trappers and others. It is the center for the region of Garden of the Gods, Manitou Hot Springs, the Ute Pass Highway and Cripple Creek mines.

Pikes Peak is of historical significance as a landmark of early traders and trappers and as the name of the region now known as Colorado⁷⁷. Discovery of gold in Colorado in 1858 (see Pikes Peak Gold Rush) brought large numbers to the region. Many returned in disappointment, but further discoveries in 1859 attracted thousands who crossed the plains with the slogan "Pikes Peak or Bust," and gradually opened up the various mining camps or settled in the valleys of the state.

[Enos A. Mills, *Rocky Mountain Wonderland*; John O'Byrne, *Pikes Peak or Bust*.]

MALCOLM G. WYER

Pikes Peak Gold Rush. Gold was discovered at Ralston Creek, near present Denver, in 1850 by Cherokee gold seekers bound for California. Reports of this find, augmented by rumors of other discoveries, led in 1858 to the organization of parties to prospect the region. The Russell-

Cherokee expedition, comprising miners experienced in the gold fields of Georgia and California, was most important. Parties went also from Missouri and Kansas. Most of these prospectors, discouraged after a few days of unsuccessful search, returned to their homes. The remnant of the Russell party discovered some placer gold in Cherry Creek and other affluents of the South Platte in July, 1858. Word of these finds brought new hopefuls to the region in the fall. Exaggerated stories of the reputed gold fields circulated through the press of the country during the winter of 1858-59. Inasmuch as Pikes Peak was the best-known landmark, though seventy-five miles from the site of the discoveries, the region was called the "Pikes Peak Gold Country," or "Cherry Creek Diggings." The meager amount of dust found in 1858 hardly warranted so much excitement. But the country, suffering from the recent Panic of 1857th, grasped avidly at any hope of rehabilitation. Merchants and newspapers in the Missouri River towns, with an eye to spring outfitting, spread golden stories, which the Atlantic coast papers generally ridiculed and denied. Sixteen guidebooks (some by interested outfitting towns) were issued to instruct amateur prairie travelers and win them to particular routes. This directed publicity through the winter built a great flood of gold seekers that burst across the plains with spring. The principal routes were up the Platte, the Arkansas and the Smoky Hill, converging at the mouth of Cherry Creek. With wagons, on horseback and afoot the argonauts rushed mountainward. The Leavenworth and Pikes Peak Expressth established the first stage line to Denver. Many early arrivals, finding the creek sands were not yellow with gold, and unenriched by a few days' futile search, turned back, crying a "Pikes Peak Humbug." Fortunately, rich gold veins were found in the mountains (Gregory lode, near present Central City, the first, May 6, 1859) in time to save the movement from complete collapse. It is estimated that 100,000 persons set out for the gold region, that half of them reached the mountains, and that only half of these remained, to found Coloradoth.

[L. R. Hafen, *Colorado, the Story of a Western Commonwealth*.]

LEROY R. HAFEN

Pike's Southwestern Expedition (1806-7). A native of New Jersey and the son of a Revolutionary officer, Zebulon M. Pike entered the U. S. Army in early manhood and served until his untimely death at the taking of Toronto in 1813. Apart from his military service, his fame rests chiefly upon his two exploring expeditions, one

to the Upper Mississippi in 1805-6th and the other to the far Southwest in 1806-7.

In general, the latter enterprise, conducted by Pike and a small band of U. S. soldiers, was one of exploration, and of conciliation of the Indian tribes in the newly acquired territory of the United States (*see Louisiana Purchase*) extending southwestward toward Santa Féth and the Spanish border. Leaving Fort Bellefontaineth (near St. Louis) July 15, 1806, the party traveled to the Pawnee towns in Kansas (precise location undetermined), and thence by way of the Arkansas River into Colorado. From here it crossed, in midwinter, the Sangre de Cristo Range to a tributary of the Rio Grande, where it was made captive by a detachment of Spanish soldiers from Santa Fé. The Spanish authorities conducted Pike to Chihuahua, and thence by a circuitous route to the American border at Natchitochesth, on July 1, 1807.

Pike's narrative, published in 1810, afforded his countrymen their first description of the great Southwest which he had traversed. Few in number, and with the scantiest of material equipment, his men had braved the treachery of the savages, the perils of starvation, the awful exposure of the Colorado Rockies in midwinter, and the prospect of perpetual confinement in a foreign land. They wrote a new chapter in the annals of human daring and devotion, and added a volume of abiding worth to the literature of New World exploration.

[M. M. Quaife, ed., *The Southwestern Expedition of Zebulon M. Pike*; S. H. Hart and A. B. Hulbert, eds., *Zebulon Pike's Arkansas Journal, In Search of the Southern Louisiana Purchase Boundary Line*; Elliott Coues, ed., *The Expeditions of Zebulon M. Pike*.]

M. M. QUAIFE

Pilgrims, THE, consisted of thirty-five members of an English Separatist church in Leiden, Holland, who, with sixty-six English sectarians and servants, sailed from Plymouth (Sept. 6/16, 1620) on the *Mayflower* and founded Plymouth Colony in New England. Though outnumbered by the English contingent, the Leiden group were the prime movers and the backbone of the migration, and the Pilgrims are generally associated with the Leiden congregation of which they were a part. This congregation, one of many Puritanth sects which opposed the Elizabethan church settlement, originated at Scrooby, Nottinghamshire, England, an obscure village on a manor of the Archbishop of York. Led by William Brewster, the Archbishop's bailiff (1590-1608) who had become a Puritan while at Cambridge (1580-*ca.* 1582), the sect formed as a Separating Congregationalistth church between 1590 and 1607. By 1607 the congregation em-

braced 100 or more rural folk, including, besides "Elder Brewster," William Bradford, son of a prosperous Austerfield farmer, and John Robinson, nonconformist Cambridge graduate who became their minister in 1607.

A minority of Scrooby village, the congregation was persecuted by conforming neighbors and (November, 1607) mildly "investigated" by the Ecclesiastical Commission of York. However, to avoid contamination in England they determined to insure religious and ecclesiastical purity by emigrating to Holland where other English sectaries found liberty to worship, and lucrative employment. After embarrassing difficulties with English officials, about 100 escaped to Amsterdam by August, 1608. Amsterdam heterodoxy troubled them, however; in May, 1609, with Dutch permission, they settled at Leiden where the local cloth industry largely employed their labors and the university stimulated their leaders. At Leiden the congregation approximately tripled in numbers (1609-18), and its polity and creed crystallized under the able leadership of John Robinson and Elder Brewster.

But after seven years they grew troubled and discontented. Their work was hard, their incomes small, their economic outlook unfavorable, their children became Dutchified, and they lacked that ecclesiastical and civil autonomy deemed necessary for their purity and proper growth. Thus, they decided (winter, 1616-17) to move to America, to the northern part of the Virginia Company's grant, under English protection, where they hoped to establish a profitable fishing and trading post. Deacon John Carver and Robert Cushman negotiated (summer, 1617) with the Virginia Company^o, hoping for official guarantees against English ecclesiastical interference. The Virginia Company encouraged them, and gave them a charter (June 9, 1619). But they needed capital. When (February-March, 1620) Thomas Weston, London Puritan merchant, proposed they employ a charter which his associates held from the Virginia Company (dated Feb. 2, 1620, in the name of John Peirce and associates) and form a joint-stock company for seven years to found a trading post in America, the Leiden people accepted. Specific terms were drawn up.

A bare majority, however, voted to remain in Leiden. The minority, taking Brewster as their "teacher," prepared to depart (April-May, 1620). A sixty-ton vessel, the *Speedwell*, was outfitted. All was in readiness to sail when difficulties with the London financiers paralyzed the enterprise until June 10, when Cushman persuaded Weston to continue co-operation. The London associates

hired the *Mayflower*^o; by mid-July it was provisioned and ready to sail from London. Aboard were some eighty men, women and children, most of them engaged by Weston as laborers or servants, and probably not of the Separatist^o persuasion. On June 22/July 1, the Leiden people left Delftshaven in the *Speedwell* and joined the *Mayflower* at Southampton. There they quarreled over business terms with Weston, who finally left them "to stand on their own legs" and, with no settlement, they sailed (Aug. 5/15). But the *Speedwell* proved unseaworthy and, after repairs at Dartmouth and Plymouth, the decision was made to sail on the *Mayflower* alone, with as many as it would carry and who still wished to go. On Sept. 6/16, 1620, with some eighty-seven passengers, fourteen servants and workmen, and a crew of forty-eight, the *Mayflower* sailed from Plymouth. Only two of those aboard—Brewster and Bradford—came from the original Scrooby congregation.

After an uneventful voyage land was sighted (Nov. 9/19) and proved to be Cape Cod, north of the limit of their patent. There, deliberately abandoning their patent—which had given them legal departure from England—they determined to settle without legal rights on Massachusetts Bay^o. To quiet murmurs of the London men and maintain order, forty-one adult males drew up and signed the famous Mayflower Compact^o (Nov. 11/21, 1620). The same day they landed in Provincetown harbor. After considerable searching they discovered Plymouth harbor (Dec. 8/18), landed the *Mayflower* there (Dec. 16/26), and spent the remainder of the winter building the town, combating illness (which reduced their number by forty-four by April). In March, 1621, they chose a governor and other officers, but not until November (1621), when Weston arrived in the *Fortune*, did they come temporarily to terms with the London financiers and receive from the Council for New England^o a charter (dated June 1/11, 1621) which gave legal birth to Plymouth Plantation^o.

[William Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation, 1606-1646*; H. M. and M. Dexter, *The England and Holland of the Pilgrims*; R. G. Usher, *The Pilgrims and Their History*; C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, Vol. I.]

RAYMOND P. STEARNS

Pillory, THE, was a device for publicly punishing petty offenders by holding them standing in a frame having holes for the head and hands. It was not as common in the American colonies as was the more merciful stocks^o, in which the prisoner sat, fastened by the hands and feet. One or the other was probably to be seen in every town in which a court sat. CLIFFORD K. SHIPTON

Pillow, Fort, "Massacre." Just before daylight on April 12, 1864, two fractional brigades of Forrest's cavalry drove in the pickets at Fort Pillow, Tenn., which was garrisoned by 557 Union troops, mixed white and colored. The Confederates having completely invested the land sides by midafternoon, demanded an unconditional surrender, which was refused; whereupon Forrest ordered the fort to be carried by storm. The Union troops fought desperately, but were driven out of the fort, over the bluff into the Mississippi River, and almost annihilated before making individual surrenders.

The wholesale slaughter of the garrison (63% killed and wounded), arising out of the incapacity of its commander, gave rise to unfair charges that the Confederates had committed a massacre.

[J. A. Wyeth, *Life of General Nathan Bedford Forrest*.]

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

Pilot Knob, Battle of (Sept. 27, 1864). When Price's (C.) expedition, between 12,000 and 20,000 strong, entered Missouri, the only Federal force between the Confederates and St. Louis was Gen. Ewing's command, 1000 men, holding Fort Davidson, at Pilot Knob. Deciding to capture this stronghold before proceeding against St. Louis, Price assaulted with two of his three divisions. He suffered a bloody repulse, losing possibly 1500 men. That night Ewing retreated toward Leasburg. Price wasted three days in futile pursuit, permitting St. Louis to be so strongly reinforced that he dared not attack it.

[*Official Records, Union and Confederate Armies*, Vol. XLI; Cyrus A. Peterson and Joseph M. Hanson, *Pilot Knob, the Thermopylae of the West*.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Pima Indians, THE, are a distinctive southwestern tribe which for unknown generations has inhabited the valleys of the Salt and Gila rivers in Arizona. Frequently at war with the Apache^{es}, they aided the whites in their wars with this tribe. They are now associated on reservations with the Papago and Maricopa.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of the American Indians*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Pima Revolt (1751). Pimeria Alta comprised present southern Arizona and northern Sonora. Its Indians, called Upper Pimas, were in charge of the Jesuits^{es}. Nine missions were in operation in 1751, the year of the revolt. Fathers Garrucho and Paver, then attending the two Arizona missions (Bac and Guevavi), escaped death by fleeing to Suamca. The revolt was headed by Don Luis, a trusted chief, whose arrogance and am-

bition fed on the strained relations existing for some time between the missionaries and the government authorities.

[H. H. Bancroft, *The North Mexican States*, Vol. I, and *Arizona and New Mexico*.]

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK

Pimitoui, Fort (1691-?), was erected in the winter of 1691-92 on or near the site of the present city of Peoria, Ill., by Tonti and LaForest. Because it was intended to replace Fort St. Louis^{es} it was originally called by that name, but it soon came to be known by the Indian word for the "lake" on which it was located. Fort Pimitoui—four log houses surrounded by 1800 pickets—was the nucleus of the first permanent French settlement in the Illinois country.

[C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country, 1673-1818*.]

PAUL M. ANGLE

Pinckney Plan, THE. This plan for a new system of government, introduced by Charles Pinckney at an early session of the Convention of 1787^{es}, has furnished an interesting subject for historical criticism. The original disappeared and the alleged "Pinckney plan" printed many years later as part of the convention record was obviously of later origin. Its general scope and contents, however, have been deduced from the convention debates.

[Max Farrand, *The Records of the Federal Convention*; J. F. Jameson, *Studies in the History of the Federal Convention of 1787*, *American Historical Review*, IX.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Pinckney's Treaty (1795), or the Treaty of San Lorenzo, was the climax of twelve years of dispute with Spain over the western and southern boundaries of the United States and the navigation of the Mississippi River. Spain was nervous lest territorial acquisitions along that river should lead to contraband traffic in the colonies of Louisiana and Florida, and was alarmed lest commercial navigation of the river should lead to economic and political penetration dangerous to Spanish sovereignty in New Spain itself. The United States contended that its treaty of peace with Great Britain (*see* Definitive Treaty of Peace) had made the Mississippi River and 31° N. Lat. its recognized boundaries, and that riparian territorial sovereignty rights upstream gave a "natural right" to free navigation in and out from the ocean, even though the lower reaches of the river were in undisputed Spanish possession.

The United States and Spain attempted, 1784-86, to reconcile their differences, but the effort failed (*see* Jay-Gardoqui Negotiations); and de-

spite the new vigor of President Washington's administration, the United States was unable to make headway until Spain became involved in the wars of the French Revolution. Then Europe's distress became America's advantage. By the Treaty of Basle (July, 1795) Spain made a separate peace with France. Fearing English vengeance, and perhaps Anglo-American alliance to guarantee the free navigation of the Mississippi^m, Spain suddenly gave in and met the American demands in a treaty signed by Thomas Pinckney at San Lorenzo, Oct. 27, 1795. This accepted the boundary claims of the United States (*see* Southern Boundary, Survey of the), established commercial relations with Spain, and provided for the free navigation of the Mississippi by American citizens and Spanish subjects, with the right of deposit^m—for the first three years at New Orleans, later at some other convenient place in Spanish territory. The treaty also provided for the adjudication by a mixed claims commission (*see* Mixed Commissions) of spoliation claims arising over Spanish arbitrary captures of American neutral vessels.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty*; Arthur Preston Whitaker, *The Spanish Frontier, 1783-1795*, and *New Light on the Treaty of San Lorenzo*, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, Vol. XV, and Godoy's Knowledge of the Terms of Jay's Treaty, *American Historical Review*, Vol. XXXV.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Pine Barren Speculations, THE, rivaling the famous Yazoo^m sales, were perpetrated principally in Montgomery, Washington and Franklin counties in Georgia, during the years 1793 and 1794. Through bribery or unbelievable carelessness, warrants were issued to a small group of speculators calling for more than 17,000,000 acres of land, ten times the area actually in those counties. Philadelphia became a center for the sale of these worthless warrants to unsuspecting victims. The bankruptcy and ruin of Robert Morris were in part caused by this speculation.

[S. G. McLendon, *History of the Public Domain of Georgia*; E. M. Coulter, *A Short History of Georgia*.]

E. MERTON COULTER

Pine Bluff, The Battles at. There were two Civil War fights at Pine Bluff: the first on Oct. 25, 1863, during the Federal conquest of Arkansas, between two Federal regiments and Gen. Sterling Price's small force, with heavy loss to the latter; the second on Feb. 22, 1865, between Federal cavalry and a portion of Gen. Kirby Smith's command.

[F. T. Miller, ed., *Photographic History of the Civil War*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Pine Ridge Indian War. *See* Messiah War.

Pine Tree Flag, THE, was a colonial flag of Massachusetts used as early as 1700. The pine tree of Massachusetts was the emblem of New England in general, and seems to have been one of the earliest symbols of the union of the thirteen colonies, as an evergreen tree was incorporated into the flags of the American forces from 1775 to 1777 in various ways, often with the motto, "An Appeal to Heaven." The pine tree and this motto were sometimes combined with the rattlesnake flag^m of the southern colonies with its motto, "Don't tread on me." In September, 1775, two American floating batteries attacked Boston under a pine-tree flag. The six armed vessels commissioned by Washington, Feb. 1, 1776, also flew a pine-tree flag. In April, 1776, the Massachusetts council resolved that for its sea service "the colors be a white flag, with a green pine tree, and the inscription, 'An Appeal to Heaven.'" An American flag of 1775 with a blue (sometimes red) field had a white canton bearing a red St. George's cross; in the upper corner of the canton next to the staff was a pine tree.

[G. H. Preble, *Origin and History of the American Flag*.]

STANLEY R. PILLSBURY

Pine Tree Shilling. To secure relief to a certain extent from a great need of currency, Massachusetts established a mint in 1651. In the following year there was issued a crude silver coin about the size of our modern half dollar but weighing only one third as much. On the obverse was MASATHVSETS IN., between two beaded circles: within the inner circle was a pine tree from which the coin gets its name. On the reverse was NEWENGLAND. AN. DOM., between two beaded circles, and 1652, XII, within the inner one. The Roman numerals indicated the number of pence in a shilling. The mint was closed in 1683.

[Government Document, *Catalogue of Coins of the United States*.]

THOMAS L. HARRIS

Piney Woods Region, THE, originally comprised some 130,000,000 acres following the wide strip of the southern coastal plain from Virginia to beyond the Mississippi River. In the long-leaf and slash-pine area early developed the naval stores industry, to be followed by the lumber industry in the whole yellow-pine area. In sandy pine barrens settled antebellum squatters who came to be called "poor whites."^m The peak of southern timber production was passed in 1916, leading to the problem of the disposal of cut-over lands. With the development of commer-

cial fertilizer, some of these areas have gone into tobacco, cotton, truck and fruit crops.

[Rupert B. Vance, *Human Geography of the South.*]

RUPERT B. VANCE

Pinkster was the Dutch Whitsuntide, or week of Pentecost, celebrated in colonial New York, and to some extent in Pennsylvania and Maryland, with picnicking, picking "pinkster" flowers, and neighborly visiting. Gaily decorated booths were erected, as on Pinkster Hill (Capitol Hill), Albany, for the sale of gingerbread, cider and applejack. The Negroes later usurped the festival, electing a Negro governor or "King Charley," dressed in colorful regalia, and paying him mock respect amid hilarious drinking, singing and dancing to African tom-toms. In *Salans-toe*, Cooper described an 18th-century celebration in Long Island, where whites continued to participate. Forbidden in Albany (1811), Pinkster disappeared during the 19th century.

[Alice Morse Earle, *Colonial Days in Old New York.*]

HAROLD E. DAVIS

Pioneer Stage Line, THE, began operating in 1851 from Sacramento to Placerville, Calif., forty-four miles. In 1857 J. B. Crandall bought an interest in it, drove an experimental coach over a rough trail through the Sierra Nevada to the Carson Valley and began operating coaches regularly thereon. In 1860 control passed to Louis McLane (Wells, Fargo & Co.'ssm western manager), and from 1861 the Pioneer was a link in their Overland Mailsm route, becoming one of the most famous stage lines on the continent. It had built a well-graded, macadamized road from Carson, Nev., to Placerville, 100 miles, which was watered daily in summer, and coaches ran at high speed. In 1865 formal announcement was made of the line's passing under Wells-Fargo control, though it may have been owned by them long before.

[William Banning and George Hugh Banning, *Six Horses*; Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Waybills.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Pioneers, THE. The terms "frontiersmen" or "early settlers" or "pioneers" are applied indiscriminately in American history to those who, in any given area, began the transformation of the wilderness and the prairie into a land of homes and farms and towns. In common usage, explorers, fur traders, soldiers and gold seekers are not classed as pioneers unless they later settled down more or less permanently. They were the vanguard, the scouts of the westward movementsm. The pioneers constituted the shock troops of the main army.

Any attempt to present a composite or generalized picture of the American pioneers obviously would be futile. The English colonists were the first pioneers, but there were striking differences in character, purpose and modes of life among the first inhabitants of such colonies as Massachusetts Bay, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Georgia. The Germans and Scotch-Irishsm who pioneered the way into the interior of Pennsylvania and into the back countrysm of Virginia and the Carolinas differed from their fellow settlers of English origin. By the time settlers began to pour over the mountains into the Mississippi Valley some of these differences were modified by the leveling effect of frontier experiences, but there were still noticeable variations in the types of pioneers and pioneer life. The first settlers in the various and distinct geographical regions of the Far West differed in some respects from each other and from the pioneers of the Middle West. Because of these and numerous other dissimilarities with respect to region, period and origin, it is impossible to fit any uniform description to the American pioneers. The best that can be done in a limited space is to point out some of their more or less general similarities in character, motives, qualities and life on the frontier.

It is safe to say that the pioneers, as a class, were people who had been in some degree and for some reason dissatisfied, maladjusted, or unsuccessful in the communities, whether in this country or in Europe, from which they migrated to the frontiersm. At the same time they were hardy, venturesome, optimistic and willing to undertake the dangers and labors of taming the wilderness. The completely satisfied and the timid were not attracted to the outer fringe of civilization.

In one form or another, the desire to improve their economic status was undoubtedly the most universal and constant motive which impelled the pioneers westward. Cheap and fertile land was the most potent lure, and usually the term "pioneers" is confined largely to those who went west to take up land and make farms for themselves. But it should not be forgotten that many were attracted by the opportunities for trade, mechanical occupations, and professional practice in newly established towns. Not all the pioneers, of course, were any more successful in their new homes than they had been in the places from which they came. A lengthy record of frontier failures, shiftlessness and degeneration could be compiled from the writings of travelers and observers. Furthermore, numerous intending pioneers, finding their expectations

too rosy-hued, sold out after a few years and went back home.

Everywhere, from first to last, the lives of the pioneers were conditioned by the wilderness environment. Their homes were built of whatever materials the region afforded. The log cabin⁹⁰, with its earthen or puncheon floor, leaky roof, fireplace and crude furniture, was the typical pioneer dwelling wherever trees were available. On the prairies, and especially in Kansas, Nebraska and the Dakotas, the sod house⁹¹ took the place of the log cabin, while in some sections of the Southwest the adobe⁹² hut was the prevailing type. There is ample evidence that these crude and cheerless homes were all too often a severe trial to the wives and mothers, whose heroic part in the story of American pioneering has never been given full justice. Not only were their long days filled with arduous and multitudinous tasks to be performed without what would now be regarded as the barest necessities, but upon them, more heavily than upon the men, fell the psychological hardships of pioneer life—loneliness⁹³, fear of Indians, homesickness for relatives and old friends, and worry in times of sickness.

Unremitting toil was likewise the lot of the pioneer men whose visions were fixed on productive farms yielding a competence for themselves and their families. The task of clearing land covered with trees was one requiring strength and perseverance, and many years would pass before a quarter-section farm could be completely freed of trees and stumps. A small clearing was first made for vegetables, and thereafter for several years the pioneer farmer devoted himself alternately to planting and caring for crops among trees deadened by girdling, and to cutting down trees, rolling them into piles and burning them or splitting them into fence rails, and afterward digging, chopping and burning out the tenacious stumps. On the prairies the work of preparing land for cultivation was less difficult, but the breaking of the tough sod was by no means an easy task.

Food was usually plentiful. Pork was the meat most widely eaten in pioneer days, supplemented by wild game as frequently as possible. Wild fruits were available in some sections. Vegetables were raised in considerable variety, and corn in the form of corn meal or hominy was a customary feature of the diet. Clothing as a rule was homemade of coarse linsey-woolsey⁹⁴, a combination of linen and wool; and not infrequently the father made the shoes for the family.

With allowance for some exceptions, the pioneers as a whole were not a healthy people. The

first settlements were often in the forests or on low lands along streams. Poorly constructed dwellings and the exposure of pioneer life resulted in weakened constitutions. Because of these and other factors, epidemics of disease frequently took a terrible toll in frontier communities. The rate of infant mortality was extremely high and early graves claimed a shockingly great proportion of the mothers.

Pioneer life, however, was not all hardship and labor and suffering. The pioneers were a gregarious people and they seized every possible occasion to get together with their fellows—at cabin raisings, logrollings, corn huskings, quilting parties, weddings, camp meetings. They were generous and hospitable to strangers and travelers. All told, they were people well fitted to lay the foundations of civilization in the wilderness.

[E. Douglas Branch, *Westward*; Everett Dick, *The Sod-House Frontier, 1854-1890*; Dan E. Clark, *The West in American History*.]

DAN E. CLARK

Pious Fund Controversy. The fund which supported the Jesuit Missions⁹⁵ in California was being administered by the Mexican government when the United States took over California⁹⁶ in 1848. Mexico then ceased payment of annuities; and, upon complaint of the missions, an arbitrator, Sir Edward Thornton, decided in 1875 that it must pay \$904,070.79, which was done. Another complaint was made in 1899, and the Hague Court of Arbitration⁹⁷ awarded the missions \$1,420,682.67 in annuities covering the years 1869-1902.

[John T. Doyle, *History of the Pious Fund of California*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Pipe, Indian. The smoking of tobacco⁹⁸ in the United States was pre-Columbian. Archaeologically, the pipe appears on the pottery level and is about contemporaneous with maize⁹⁹. The cigar and the cigarette were not used north of Cuba and Mexico, but two kinds of pipes were in use, the elbow pipe in the East, the tubular pipe in the West. In post-Columbian time smoking was primarily a ceremonial function, probably associated with the use of incense. Yet, the offering of a pipe to a guest was a common procedure and so the symbol of hospitality. Indians did not smoke while at work, nor on the march, and seldom when alone, but nearly always when in company. A single long-stemmed pipe would be passed from one man to another.

Every important ceremony involved the use of a pipe and its presentation to the heavens, to the four directions and to the earth. It was also passed back and forth among the chief participants.

The calumet, or peace pipe, is the best known form of pipe, characterized by a specially decorated stem, and presented as a guarantee of peace and protection. A stranger carrying a calumet was safe from all enemies. Such a pipe came to be used at every official conference with white men and in the making of peace treaties, the passing of which between representatives of a government and an Indian tribe was a guarantee of friendship. Frequently two pipes were used, each party presenting a pipe to the other, to be kept as a pledge of good faith.

[G. A. West, *Tobacco, Pipes and Smoking Customs of the American Indians*, Pts. I and II, Bulletin of the Public Museum of the City of Milwaukee.]

CLARK WISSLER

Pipe Lines, Early. In order to eliminate the risk, expense and uncertainty of transporting oil by boat or wagon, Heman Jones proposed in November, 1861, at a meeting at Tarr farm on Oil Creek, Pennsylvania, the laying of a four-inch wooden pipe to Oil City. The idea met with favor but on account of the teamsters' opposition, the state legislature refused to charter the company. In 1862 Barrows and Company of Tarr farm began operating the first successful pipe line, conveying oil from the Burning well to their refinery, about 1000 feet away. Other early experiments with pipe lines met with only partial success owing to poor quality pipes, leaky lead joints and faulty pumps. They demonstrated, however, the feasibility of the pipe line.

In the fall of 1865 Samuel Van Syckle began trenching and laying a two-inch wrought-iron pipe from Pitholesm to Miller farm on the Oil Creek Railroad, about five and a quarter miles distant. From the time Van Syckle started work until he completed the project and demonstrated its usefulness, he was the subject of ridicule. Just prior to its completion, disgruntled teamsters, who saw their occupation threatened, maliciously cut the line in several places. Nevertheless, on Oct. 9, Van Syckle finished his line and made the first test, in which eighty-one barrels of oil were forced through the pipe in one hour, doing the work of 300 teams working ten hours per day. The experiment worked perfectly and Van Syckle had the pleasure of seeing his persecutors silenced. Two weeks later another pipe line was completed from Pithole to Henry's Bend on the Allegheny River. The Van Syckle line proved so successful that a second pipe was laid to Miller farm and commenced delivering oil on Dec. 8, 1865. Four days later the Pennsylvania Tubing and Transportation Company completed a gravity line from Pithole to Oleopolis on the Alle-

gheny River; it had a capacity of 7000 barrels every twenty-four hours. Aroused over the prospect of the oil trade being diverted to other points, some of the Titusville businessmen organized the Titusville Pipe Company, laid a pipe to Pithole, about nine miles away, and began pumping oil in March, 1866, at the rate of 3000 barrels per day. During the same month, Henry Harley and Company laid two pipe lines from Bennehoff Run to Shaffer farm on the Oil Creek Railroad, a distance of two miles.

While the pipe lines reduced the cost of shipping oil to the uniform rate of \$1.00 per barrel, they proved to be monopolies of the worst sort, keeping their prices just below the teamsters' in order to eliminate teaming, yet high enough so that producers derived little benefit. Even before the first pipe line to Miller farm had been completed, teamsters began leaving the oil fields and when the Harley lines were completed, more than 400 teams left at one time. Those teamsters who remained made threats against the pipe lines and even set fire to the Harley storage tanks at Shaffer, causing a loss of about \$10,000. Rather than continue the violence, teamsters reduced the price of teaming, but their ruin was inevitable.

Not long after the completion of the Van Syckle line, his partners failed financially. Van Syckle assumed payment of the debt and agreed that the First National Bank of Titusville should operate the line until the debt had been liquidated. Owing to unforeseen difficulties, however, Van Syckle never regained control. W. H. Abbott and Henry Harley bought Van Syckle's line and combined it with Harley's, in 1867, to form the Allegheny Transportation Company, the first great pipe-line company.

During the next few years short pipe lines multiplied, crossing and paralleling one another in every direction. Competition was keen and ruinous rate wars ensued. These, and other, factors soon brought about the consolidation of the lines.

[Paul H. Giddens, *The Birth of the Oil Industry*.]

PAUL H. GIDDENS

Pipe Staves, barrel staves and hogshhead staves were important articles of commerce and of domestic use in early America. All were rived from straight-grained logs of varying lengths, shaved smooth with a drawknife or plane and given shape with a slight bulge of width in the middle, so that when hooped together from each end the resulting barrel, hogshhead, or cask would be a double conoid. A pipe was a large cask, holding usually half a tun, that is, two hogshheads or

126 wine gallons. Inasmuch as a large cask when filled was very heavy, pipe staves had to be thicker and stronger than barrel staves. Pipe staves were sent in large quantities to the wine-producing countries of Europe and the West Indies. The standard length of pipe staves was 4½ feet; the width only a few inches; and they were usually made of oak, white or red. Prices ran from £6 to £18 a 1000, depending on the quality, stage of manufacture (whether rough as rived, or shaved and shaped); also depending on the commodity or currency given in exchange, the time and place of the transaction, etc. Staves packed close in shipping, hence were preferred in outgoing cargoes to finished empty casks, which required much room. The trade in pipe staves began early and continued long.

[William B. Weedon, *Economic and Social History of New England*.]

JOHN W. WAYLAND

Piqua, Battle of (Aug. 8, 1780). In retaliation for Bird's raid^o into Kentucky, George Rogers Clark led nearly 1000 frontiersmen up the Little Miami River against the Shawnee towns of Old Chillicothe^o (near Xenia) and Piqua (near Springfield). The former was abandoned and burned, the Indians fleeing to Piqua, their capital, some twelve miles distant. Clark divided his forces in an attempt to surround the place, but Col. Benjamin Logan, in command of one of the columns, became entangled in a grassy swamp and accomplished little. However, many of the Indians fled at Clark's approach, leaving a remnant to sustain the American attack. The battle was hardly more than a long-drawn-out skirmish, with slight losses on both sides. After Clark used a small field piece to dislodge the Indians from the cabins, they scattered into the forest, leaving their town to frontier vengeance. Huts and crops were destroyed, and for several months Kentucky enjoyed a respite from Indian attacks.

[E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, *History of Ohio*, Vol. II; J. A. James, *The Life of George Rogers Clark*.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Piqua, Council of (1751). See Pickawillany.

Pirate Gold. The very expression conjures to mind romance, adventure, easily gotten gain. Thus pirate gold is perhaps more significant in literature than in history. Poe's *Gold Bug* and Stevenson's *Treasure Island* are significant primarily as masterpieces of a vast literature of the same basic appeal and color.

Why sailors, and above all pirates, the most irresponsible of the spendthrift tribe, should be expected to leave treasure troves merits ex-

planation. In popular concept the pirate, when not boarding plate-laden galleons or looting churches, was a constant fugitive from justice, a social pariah daring to land only at tiny, isolated ports or on uncharted islands. Necessarily, he had no chance to enjoy his loot. Presumably, he secreted his wealth against the day when he might live a life of rectitude, luxury and ease. At this point, according to popular concept, the loot-wealthy pirate falls in battle or goes to execution dock, leaving to lucky finders mysterious scraps of parchment. Brought together, and decoded, these constitute the inevitable key to the buried fortunes of blood-encrusted silver plate and gold doubloons.

Pirates themselves are largely responsible for this concept. The case of William Kidd is illustrative. Faced with a death penalty, what was more natural than Kidd's effort to stay execution by reference to untold wealth that would be lost with his death? Few, if any, serious historians believe Kidd had a secret hoard. Certainly, his prosecutors did not. Nevertheless, the Kidd gold is the hardest myth of many such treasure-trove perennials.

But pirates were not the last to trade upon such myths. Within the present decade, stock has been sold in expeditions to retrieve lost pirate gold. One of the greatest and crudest of recent swindles rested upon regaining the buccaneer fortune of Sir Francis Drake.

The entire popular concept of pirate gold collapses in the face of one easily established truth. Pirates had ample chances to buy shore revels with their gold. Moreover, they did. British ports in the West Indies, the colonial Carolinas and even Providence and New York were often relaxation centers for pirates. Occasionally a pirate was thrifty, or lucky, and did come into appreciable wealth. In such cases his hoard was normally spent to buy immunity, either from the law officers of the crown, or from less fortunate fellow cutthroats.

Other forms of maritime treasure troves are often confused with pirate gold. Most works treating the subject feature the £300,000 found off the coast of Hispaniola by Sir William Phips, first royal governor of Massachusetts. His, and other similar recoveries, did not involve pirate gold. They were salvage operations.

[Charles Johnson, *A General History of the Pyrates*.]

JIM DAN HILL

Pirates and Piracy on American Coasts. From 1632 to 1827 our Atlantic and Gulf coasts were infested by numerous pirates who preyed upon our shipping and cost us great losses in ships and

lives. Indeed, the first pirate appearing on any of our coasts, Francis Drake^m, might well have cost us our whole Pacific coast, when he visited California in 1579, claimed possession of it for England, and later drew up a contract with Queen Elizabeth to colonize it.

From New England's earliest settlement, its shipping suffered from pirates on its coast. In 1653 Massachusetts made piracy punishable with death; and its governors sometimes sent out armed ships to attack offshore pirates. Our colonial governors after 1650 granted many "privateering" commissions to sea desperadoes and winked at their piracies—a popular procedure then. The Navigation Acts led to colonial smuggling^{am}—and eventually to piracy. Colonial merchants and people bought pirates' stolen goods and thus obtained necessary commodities—cheaply, too. New York, Newport and Philadelphia were rivals in this scandalous trade, with Boston, Virginia and the Carolinas also engaging in it.

The Earl of Bellomont was made governor of New York and New England with orders to "suppress the prevailing piracy that was causing so much distress along the [American] coast"—and in 1697 reported general colonial connivance with pirates, especially in New York, Rhode Island and in Philadelphia, "where they not onlie wink at, but Imbrace Pirats, men and shippes." One New York merchant secured \$500,000 in seven years through pirate promoting.

Legal privateering ended in 1697—but many privateers^m then became avowed pirates and preyed on shipping along the coast. The period 1705–25 was memorable for the maximum of piracies; and 1721–24 saw a reign of terror on the New England coast. English men-of-war ended this pirate peril, but, after the Revolution, piratical attacks on our ships by French "privateers" brought on the Franco-American Misunderstanding^m (1798–1801) and forced the United States to create a navy. Piratical operations of English men-of-war and "privateers" on our coasts and the high seas—including impressment^m of our seamen—led to the War of 1812^m.

The period 1805–25 witnessed a vast resurgence of piracy. This led to the maintenance and increase of our navy, then very busy at suppressing piracy and convoying our ships. Over 3000 piracies were recorded between 1814 and 1824 alone—half of them on our shipping.

The Gulf coast long was haunted by pirates; and after 1805 our navy was engaged in warring on pirates on the Louisiana and Gulf coast. The Barataria^m pirates were driven out in 1814; the

Aury-Lafitte pirates from Galveston in 1817. In 1816–24 we faced a perplexing problem in handling the piratical "privateers" of the new Latin-American republics. Congress finally was so angered by these freebooters' depredations that in 1819 it passed an act, prescribing the death penalty for piracy.

The Spaniards of Cuba and Puerto Rico sent out many pirates who captured our ships, murdered their crews, and nearly brought on a war with these two colonies of Spain. Congress denounced "this truly alarming piracy" in 1822. In 1823–24 we despatched a strong naval squadron to suppress these pirates; and 1827 saw the end of piracy on all our coasts.

[George Francis Dow and John Henry Edmonds, *The Pirates of the New England Coast*; Gardner W. Allen, *Our Navy and the West Indian Pirates*; George Wycherley, *Buccaneers of the Pacific*.]

GEORGE WYCHERLEY

Pirogue, the dugout canoe common on the western waters, was hollowed by fire or adz, usually from the sycamore, cypress or cottonwood tree, and had one or both ends square. Its capacity could be increased by splitting it lengthwise and inserting planks between the two halves, spiking them in place or binding them with thongs and filling the interstices with clay, rosin or oakum. The word had many variations, it probably originated from a Carib and Arawakan word which became the Spanish *piragua*.

LELAND D. BALDWIN

Pistole, **THE**, was a gold coin current in Spain, Italy and America in the 18th century. Its value varied, but it was commonly worth fifteen English shillings. Its French equivalent was the *louis d'or*. Virginians of the first half of the 18th century spoke of values in terms of *pistoles* almost as readily as pounds.

CARL L. CANNON

"Pit," THE, is the market where agricultural commodities are bought and sold. Specifically, it refers to the Chicago Board of Trade rooms where world opinion on the price of grain (wheat, corn, rye, oats), provisions and cotton is registered. By providing opportunities for future buying (the making of contracts for future delivery) and hedging (the protection of the buyer against price changes), the "pit" tends to promote a liquid market.

On March 18, 1848, a call to organize a market for grain buyers and sellers was issued by a group of the leading commission merchants of Chicago. As a result, on Monday, April 3, 1848, the Board of Trade was organized with a membership of eighty-two. The objectives were: "To

maintain a Commercial Exchange; to promote uniformity in the customs and usages of merchants; to inculcate principles of justice and equity in trade; to facilitate the speedy adjustment of business disputes, to acquire and disseminate valuable commercial and economic information; and, generally, to secure to its members the benefits of co-operation in the furtherance of their legitimate pursuits."

Two years later, in 1850, the Board of Trade was organized under a general statute "for the incorporation of boards of trade and chambers of commerce," approved by the Illinois legislature on Feb. 8, 1849. On Feb. 18, 1859, the "Board of Trade of the City of Chicago" was incorporated by a special legislative act. Under this charter the Board is governed by a president, a first vice-president, a second vice-president, and fifteen directors.

Chicago has always possessed the three characteristics essential for a grain market: closeness to productive areas; cheap transportation facilities; and a consumptive demand. The Federal Trade Commission⁷⁰ reported in 1920 that "the marketing facilities developed by the Board of Trade during the first decade after the charter grant of 1859 comprised essentially the facilities offered by the exchange today. Weighing, inspection and grading, warehousing, the market quotations service, arbitration of commercial disputes, as well as the provision of floor facilities for cash and future trading, were all in evidence during this early period."

Three classes of traders which have worked through the Board are: the future commission operators; the cash commission men; and the terminal elevator men. And, states one authority, the procedure which has been developed "may be called a dual system of marketing which permits the grain to take the shortest possible route from farmer-producer to consumer, with minimum speculative risks; brings to grain the most advantageous terms of finance; absorbs any amount of grain from a farmer's wagon load to a ship's cargo at the same price per bushel and without major price disturbances; absorbs an entire crop and holds it against consumptive need with no sacrifice in price on the part of the farmer; registers a constant price according to world supply and demand conditions; and by accurate weights, grades, and equitable rules of trade safeguards the interest of both producer and consumer."

Through the Federal Trade Commission, the Future Trading Act of 1921, the Grain Futures Act of the same year, and the Commodity Exchange Act of 1936, the National Government

has attempted to prevent manipulation, excessive speculation, and fraud in the grain markets.

[Charles H. Taylor, ed., *History of the Board of Trade of the City of Chicago; Report of the Federal Trade Commission on the Grain Trade.*]

BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH

Pithole. The United States Petroleum Company in 1864 leased a portion of the Thomas Holmden farm on Pithole Creek, about six miles east of Oil Creek and equidistant from Titusville and Oil City, Pa., and drilled a well, which in January, 1865, began flowing at the rate of about 250, and ultimately 1200, barrels of oil daily. The United States well, as it was known, precipitated a wild stampede to the Holmden farm. Leases sold for fabulous sums; other wells were drilled; a city, called Pithole, sprang into existence and became a whirlpool of excitement and speculation. In September, 1865, the population reached 15,000, and the daily production exceeded 6000 barrels. Then, within six months, Pithole became a deserted city owing to the failure of its wells.

[Paul H. Giddens, *The Birth of the Oil Industry.*]

PAUL H. GIDDENS

Pitt, Fort. A temporary structure, commonly known as Fort Pitt, was begun soon after the British forces of Gen. John Forbes⁷¹ arrived at the forks of the Ohio, on the present site of Pittsburgh, Pa., Sept. 25, 1758. It was completed about Jan. 1, 1759, and stood on the banks of the Monongahela River, approximately 200 yards above the site of Fort Duquesne⁷². On Sept. 3, 1759, Gen. John Stanwix personally directed the beginning of the work on a permanent fortification, correctly known as Fort Pitt and sufficiently formidable to assure British supremacy in the region. Although this fort was occupied in 1760, it was not completed until the summer of 1761 and the Redoubt, the only standing remains and now known as the Blockhouse, was added in 1764 by Col. Henry Bouquet⁷³. Fort Pitt was a five-sided structure, surrounded by a ditch, occupying the point between the two rivers, although situated nearer the Monongahela than the Allegheny. A brick revetment supported the ramparts on the two sides facing the land. The three sides facing the rivers were supported by pickets. The British maintained a garrison at Fort Pitt to aid in preserving order among the settlers and Indians until late in 1772, when the troops were withdrawn. In the interim between 1772 and January, 1774, only caretakers occupied the fort until Dr. John Connolly of Virginia took possession of it (*see* Dunmore's War). Capt. John Neville, with a company of Virginia patriots, held control from September, 1775, to

June, 1777, relinquishing his command to Gen. Edward Hand of the Continental forces. Except for one short interval, the fort was a base of operations for western Revolutionary campaigns (see Brodhead's Allegheny Campaign). Gen. William Irvine repaired the fort in 1782 but thereafter it was permitted to deteriorate, although parts of it were occupied by army officials after 1792 and the ramparts were still standing in 1800.

[Pennsylvania Indian Forts Commission, *Report of the Commission to Locate the Site of the Frontier Forts of Pennsylvania*, 2 vols., Harrisburg, C. M. Busch, State Printer, 1892.]

R. J. FERGUSON

Pittman Act, THE (April 23, 1918), provided for the breaking up of not more than 350,000,000 silver dollars and the export of said silver to India and the Orient for our own account and for the account of our allies in the World War. Provision was also made for the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes⁹⁹ to take the place of the silver dollars and certificates withdrawn from circulation, and for their subsequent retirement and replacement with silver dollars and certificates by the purchase of silver from domestic producers at not less than \$1 per ounce. These provisions have (1939) all been carried out.

[N. Carothers, *Fractional Money*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Pittsburgh Landing. See Shiloh, Battle of.

Pittsburgh. Situated at the point where the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers form the Ohio, Pittsburgh has enjoyed a location that early earned the sobriquet of "Gateway to the West." Laid out in 1764 by John Campbell, the small trading post which had recently survived Pontiac's Conspiracy⁹⁹ became successively county seat in 1788, borough in 1794 and city in 1816. That same strategic situation that had made it the logical point for the fort (see Pitt, Fort) controlling the upper Mississippi Valley also made it the entrepôt for the waves of migration to the westward. With the opening of the Mississippi, Pittsburgh began her period as a commercial city. Her manufactures found their way to New Orleans and ultimately to Baltimore and Philadelphia, first on flatboats, then by keelboat and river steamboat⁹⁹. The impetus given to nascent industry by the demands of westward migration was renewed by the War of 1812⁹⁹. Western armies found one of their chief sources of supplies in that city, and Perry at Lake Erie⁹⁹ drew heavily upon the community. At the same time western and southern areas that had been drawing upon the city now began sending her

raw materials by steamboat. This demand for manufactured products, combined with the relative abundance of certain necessary raw materials, soon made the iron and glass industries of Pittsburgh of national importance. During the Civil War, Pittsburgh iron foundries and mills played an important role in supplying Union armies with cannon and armor plate. The transition from iron to steel was neither long nor difficult, and the city, under the guidance of her Carnegies, Fricks and Olivers, soon served a world market. In less than a century and a half this village of 1200 inhabitants had evolved into a metropolis of more than three quarters of a million people, the leading industrial area in the heart of the richest market in the world.

[Leland D. Baldwin, *Pittsburgh: The Story of a City*; Erasmus Wilson, ed., *Standard History of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*, Sarah H. Killikelly, *The History of Pittsburgh, Its Rise and Progress*.]

FRANK B. SESSA

Pittsburgh, Indian Treaty at (1775), was the result of a conference of the Indian tribes in that region with commissioners from the Assembly of Virginia and Richard Butler, Indian Agent for the Indian Department of the Continental Congress. The Delaware, Shawnee, Mingo, Seneca, Wyandot and Ottawa tribes⁹⁹ were restless and uneasy because of Lord Dunmore's War⁹⁹ of the previous year. Furthermore, the Shawnee Indians had taken captives, and stolen Negro slaves from Virginians which the commissioners sought to recover. The commissioners were anxious to placate the Indians and procure their neutrality in the approaching struggle between Great Britain and the Americans.

Chief White Eyes of the Delawares was the spokesman for the Indians; George Morgan, the Indian trader, gave his wisdom and counsel to all; and Butler acted for the Indian Department. The treaty was a success. The Indians, plied with gifts and the promise on the part of the whites to respect the Ohio River as a boundary, were satisfied and agreed not to fight in the forthcoming struggle. The Shawnees agreed to return the captives and the stolen slaves, and the Senecas and Delawares engaged to assist them in that duty. The commissioners of Virginia sent letters to white settlers in the region requesting them not to cross the Ohio and to avoid irritating the Indians.

[Max Savelle, *George Morgan, Colony Builder*.]

R. J. FERGUSON

Pittsburgh Gazette, THE (variously the *Pittsburgh Gazette and Manufacturing and Mercantile Advertiser*, the *Pittsburgh Daily Gazette and Advertiser*, the *Pittsburgh Commercial Gazette*,

the *Gazette Times*, and the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*), is generally considered to have been the first newspaper established west of the Allegheny Mountains. The founders were John Scull and Joseph Hall, Philadelphia printers, who conveyed their press over the mountains in a Conestoga wagon⁹⁹ and printed the first number of the paper on July 29, 1786.

[J. C. Andrews, *Pittsburgh's Post-Gazette*; ERASMUS WILSON, *Standard History of Pittsburgh*; *Pittsburgh Gazette* newspaper files in the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and other Pittsburgh libraries.]

J. CUTLER ANDREWS

Pittsburgh Resolutions. On receipt of the news of Lexington and Concord⁹⁹ a meeting of the Virginia partisans in the vicinity of Pittsburgh was called for May 16, 1775. The meeting appointed a committee of twenty-eight for the District of West Augusta, and a standing committee vested with emergency powers. Approbation was expressed of the conduct of the minute-men⁹⁹ of Massachusetts Bay; an assessment was made on taxables for money to be used in buying munitions for arming the militia; friendship for the Indians was expressed; and the raising of independent companies encouraged.

[Neville B. Craig, *History of Pittsburgh*.]

LELAND D. BALDWIN

Pivotal States are those in which the two major political parties are nearly evenly balanced, and which also are sufficiently populous to have a large number of votes in the Electoral College⁹⁹. Since with rare exceptions the electoral votes of each state are cast as a unit, the outcome of a presidential election may turn upon a very small popular plurality in one or two pivotal states. Thus in 1884 the margin by which Grover Cleveland carried New York State, and consequently the nation, was less than 1200 votes. As a result of this condition, candidates who come from pivotal states are considered to possess what practical politicians call "availability" to a much greater degree than the sons of less-favored commonwealths. Of the thirty-two Republican and Democratic nominees for the Presidency between 1876 and 1936, inclusive, ten were New Yorkers, of whom five were successful, eight were Ohioans, of whom six were elected. For similar reasons Indiana is resorted to frequently for vice-presidential candidates, having been called upon in this way by the major parties no less than seven times during the sixty years ending in 1936.

ROBERT C. BROOKS

Placer Mining. A placer deposit is one in which the gold or other minerals are found loosely

mixed with the sand at the bottom of a stream bed or similar alluvial deposit. It differs from lode mining⁹⁹ where the minerals are always found in place. It was placer gold which started the gold rushes to California, Pikes Peak and the Klondike⁹⁹. The pure gold is washed from the sand or debris by means of a gold pan. Because of its weight gold, if present, will gravitate to the bottom of the pan. Here the "colors" (tiny specks) or nuggets of gold are picked out with a tweezer or amalgamated with mercury. Improvements in placer mining, such as the rocker, sluice-box, long tom, hydraulic nozzle, boom dam, or dredge, are all designed to wash more gravel with a given amount of time and labor. The richest placer deposits have been in California and Alaska.

[C. F. Jackson and J. B. Knaebel, *Small Scale Placer-Mining Methods*; E. B. Wilson, *Hydraulic and Placer Mining*.]

PERCY S. FRITZ

Plain, Fort, was built in colonial times to protect the farmers near Canajoharie, N. Y., from the Iroquois⁹⁹. It saved the settlers from the Onondagas in 1777, and on numerous occasions provided a rallying point for troop movements up the Schoharie Valley, as well as a refuge for the wounded. Its importance ceased after the raids of 1781.

[W. M. Reid, *Old Fort Johnson*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Plains, The Great. For purposes of historical discussion, the Great Plains may be roughly defined as the region lying between the 98th meridian and the Rocky Mountains. With some exceptions, the area has a relatively level surface sloping gradually upward to the foothills of the mountains; it is almost treeless; and it is sub-humid or semi-arid, with respect to rainfall. In the two latter respects it presented an environment strikingly different from that to which American settlers had previously been accustomed in their westward march. Before the period of white occupation the Great Plains were the grazing area of huge herds of buffalo⁹⁹, and the home of virile, warlike Indian tribes such as the Sioux, the Cheyennes, the Arapahoes, the Pawnees, the Comanches and the Apaches⁹⁹.

The Great Plains first appear in recorded history in the reports of early Spanish explorations, especially that of Coronado⁹⁹, 1540-42. During the next two centuries the Spanish established themselves in what are now New Mexico and Texas, and extended their knowledge of the country to the northward at least as far as Nebraska or Wyoming. During the first half of the

18th century, French explorers and traders saw many portions of the Great Plains area, as did other traders working out of St. Louis after 1763, while the whole region was in Spanish possession. However, Americans in general knew very little of the region when the northern portion was transferred to the United States by the Louisiana Purchase Treaty⁹⁹.

Discouraging reports concerning the habitability of the Great Plains were given by the explorers, Lewis and Clark (1804-6), Zebulon M. Pike (1806-7), and Stephen H. Long (1820)⁹⁹. As a result, the region came to be known as the Great American Desert⁹⁹—a barrier to the further westward expansion of American settlements. It was this belief, in part at least, that led to the Indian removal⁹⁹ policy, formulated by Calhoun and Monroe in 1825 and carried into effect during the administration of Andrew Jackson. By 1840 the Great Plains were included in what was confidently designated as the permanent Indian Country⁹⁹.

Even before 1840 the observations of traders going to and from Santa Fé⁹⁹ began to modify the general belief in the desertlike character of the Great Plains. Then, during the 1840's the region was crossed by emigrants to Oregon, by military and exploring expeditions, by the Mormons on their way to Utah, and by thousands of gold seekers rushing to California⁹⁹. During this decade, also, the territorial jurisdiction of the United States was greatly expanded by the annexation of Texas, the acquisition of Oregon and the Mexican cession⁹⁹. Not only did the entire Great Plains region now belong to the United States, but it was no longer thinkable that an inviolable Indian country should bar the way to the free movement of Americans to the new and desirable possessions.

During the 1850's the Great Plains region was alive with activity. Commissioners and Indian agents were busy making treaties with the Indians, in which the tribesmen ceded territory, agreed to move, or gave permission for the laying out of roads and the establishment of military posts (see Laramie, Fort, Treaties of). Emigrants continued to pour over the trails to California and Oregon, and in 1859 there was a stampede to the Colorado gold fields (see Pikes Peak Gold Rush). Following the congressional act of 1853 the region was crossed by parties surveying routes for a railroad to the Pacific (see Stevens' Railroad Survey). Stagecoaches⁹⁹ carrying mail and passengers to California began running early in the decade, and by 1858 John Butterfield's famous Overland Mail⁹⁹ was operating over a southern route.

The discoveries of gold in the entire Rocky Mountain area during the early 1860's greatly stimulated the service of transportation and communication across the plains. Not only were stagecoach lines expanded, but a vast wagon-freighting business⁹⁹ was developed, and the famous pony express⁹⁹ greatly expedited mail service. By the close of the Civil War the Great Plains area was aflame with Indian wars, which continued until the close of the decade, with frequent outbreaks still later (see Sioux Wars). During this same period the Union Pacific Railroad⁹⁹ was built westward, to be followed soon by other transcontinental railroads.

Thus far the Great Plains had been regarded mainly as an unattractive country to be crossed in order to reach more desirable localities. Beginning late in the 1860's, however, and during the ensuing two decades the region was the scene of the rise and decline of the great range cattle industry, with its succession of "cow towns," its long drives from Texas to the northern ranges or to shipping points on the railroads, its round-ups, and its huge areas of illegally fenced public land⁹⁹. The decline of this colorful activity was due to various factors, but chiefly to the relentless pressure of the settlers who, after the Civil War, launched themselves onto the Great Plains and year by year steadily narrowed the open range⁹⁹ until it finally disappeared before the end of the century (see Barbed Wire). The later history of the last American frontier⁹⁹ is largely concerned with problems of agricultural adjustment to an unfavorable environment, particularly during the 1930's when terrific dust storms⁹⁹ devastated many sections of the Great Plains.

[Walter P. Webb, *The Great Plains*; Frederic L. Paxson, *History of the American Frontier*; Dan E. Clark, *The West in American History*.]

DAN E. CLARK

Plains of Abraham. See Abraham, Plains of.

Plan of 1776, THE, was a model set of articles for treaties to be negotiated with foreign powers by the newly independent United States. It was drawn up by a committee composed of John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, John Dickinson and Robert Morris, and was adopted Sept. 17, 1776. The plan remains significant because of its definition of neutral rights, that is to say, the Freedom of the Seas⁹⁹. The committee selected from 18th-century European treaties such definitions of neutral rights as appealed to small-navied powers: free ships, free goods⁹⁹; freedom of neutrals to trade in noncontraband between port and port of a belligerent (this a repudiation of the

novel British Rule of the War of 1756th); and restricted the category of contrabandth to a carefully defined list of arms, munitions and implements of war, not including foodstuffs or naval stores. Blockadeth was not defined. These principles were written into the Franco-American Treaty of Amity and Commerce of 1778th; into all other such treaties negotiated with European powers in the 18th century, excepting Great Britain; and in most of the first treaties of amity and commerce negotiated with Latin-American republics. They also appeared in the Armed Neutralityth of 1780, and of 1800; and the Declaration of Paris of 1856th confirmed as international law the principle of free ships, free goods, and also a definition of blockade.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Diplomatic History of the United States*; Carlton Savage, *Policy of the United States toward Maritime Commerce in War*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Plan of Union, THE, was an agreement made in 1801 between the Congregational Association of Connecticut and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church to combine their work on the frontier wherever the two bodies came together. The plan provided for the settlement of either a Presbyterian or Congregationalth minister over mixed congregations, and also for the settlement of a Presbyterian minister over a Congregational church, and vice versa. Its purpose was to "promote mutual forbearance and the spirit of accommodation" between adherents of both churches in frontier communities. As a whole it worked in the interest of Presbyterianism, due to the more effective church polity of the latter and the willingness of Congregationalists to be absorbed in the West. It was repudiated by the Old School Presbyterians in 1837 when the Presbyterians were divided into Old and New School bodies, and in 1852 by the Congregationalists.

[W. W. Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier*, Vol. II, *The Presbyterians*, and Vol. III, *The Congregationalists*; W. S. Kennedy, *The Plan of Union: or a History of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches of the Western Reserve*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Plank Roads, introduced into the United States from Canada about 1837, were first constructed in New York, later being widely adopted in South Carolina, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan and other states. Thousands of miles were built at a mileage cost of from \$1000 to \$2400. Roadways were first well drained, with ditches on either side. Then planks, three or four inches thick and eight feet long, were laid at right angles to stringers which were placed lengthwise of the

road. Planks were prepared by portable sawmills which were set up in neighboring forests. For a time, plank roads successfully competed with railroads.

[B. H. Meyer, *History of Transportation in the United States before 1860*.]

CHARLES B. SWANEY

Planned Economy. In contrast to the theory of individualism, under which each person carries on economic activities much as he pleases, is the theory of a planned economy. Advocates of the theory are in disagreement as to whether the planning, for the purpose of directing the economic system toward what they regard as socially desirable ends, should be done by the legislative or executive authority, or through co-operative action of business. So far as the United States is concerned, they are generally agreed that the planning should be national. The theory of a planned economy implies fact finding to learn what needs must be met; limitation of production to meet those needs; and planning for future needs and for the development of new activities. Proposals for a planned economy were frequent after the beginning of the great depression in 1929. The theory was embodied to some extent in the New Dealth program.

[Findlay Mackenzie, ed., *Planned Society Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow*; G. N. Stanley and H. M. Sayre, *Economic Planning*, pamphlet.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Plantation System of the South, THE, was developed to meet the need of supplying a world's demand for certain staple crops. While in 17th-century England the word "plantation" meant a colony, the relationship between the London Companyth and its plantation, Virginia (1607-24), meant far more than that. The company transported the settlers, who were to be laborers, provided the taskmasters, fed and clothed the workers, and received the proceeds of their labor. Ten years' experience revealed numerous defects in operating a whole colony as one estate, consequently the company's possession was divided into smaller industrial units and private ownership granted; and when Virginia passed to the English crown (1624), it became a commonwealth of independent farms and private plantations. While tobacco was known and used in England, the discovery of a new method of curing it (1616) increased the demand and spurred large-scale production, and the demand for labor thus created was filled by Dutch traders, resulting in the adaptation of Negro slavesth to the system. This was the distinguishing feature of the industry, because the racial factor and slave status of the

laborers produced a fairly rigid regimentation. By the end of the 17th century the Virginia system was a model for the other Southern colonies.

As finally evolved, the system employed large laboring forces (1000 acres and 100 slaves was considered a highly productive unit), a division of labor and a routine under the direction of a central authority to produce tobacco, rice, sugar and cotton^{qv} in large quantities for domestic and foreign markets. While tobacco and rice were important in the evolution of the system, cotton was the greatest force in making it dominant in Southern economic life. The introduction of sea-island cotton into Georgia (1786) and the invention of the cotton gin^{qv} by Eli Whitney (1793), making possible the profitable growing of short staple cotton, enabled the South to supply the English textile industry with the commercial quantities of raw cotton so urgently demanded. In 1800 the South exported 35,000 bales, over 320,000 in 1820, and the 1860 crop was 5,000,000. The plantation industry was in reality the "big business" of the ante-bellum South.

The plantations were self-sustained communities, with slave quarters, storehouses, smokehouses, barns, tools, livestock, gardens, orchards and fields. The Negroes^{qv} were usually worked in gangs, although the task system was not uncommon, skilled slaves were employed in their special capacity; and care was taken to keep as large a number of slaves as possible busy throughout the year. The larger the plantation the more highly organized it was apt to be. In the absence of the owner, the establishment was directed by his agent, usually the overseer^{qv}.

Climate and soil largely determined the location of the plantation system. The upper South (Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, North Carolina) produced tobacco; the South Carolina and Georgia tidewater, sea-island cotton and rice; the rich bottoms of Louisiana, sugar cane; and throughout the piedmont^{qv} region short staple cotton held sway. Because slave labor was used, the "black belts" were identical with the plantation zones. With its development in Virginia, the plantation regime spread southwest with our national territorial expansion, until in 1860 most of the climatic zone available for staple production was affected.

The entire social and economic life of the South was geared to the plantation industry, although in 1850 two thirds of all the white people of the section had no connection with slavery, and 1000 families received over \$50,000,000 per year in contrast with about \$60,000,000 for the remaining 666,000 families. This concentration of wealth produced an economic power that

dominated every field, similar to that of the Northern industrial magnates of 1880.

While seemingly affluent, the plantation system was financially and commercially dependent upon the Eastern cities, New York especially, reducing Southern cities to mere markets, and sending fluid capital in insurance, freights, tariffs, warehouse fees, etc., to New York and Philadelphia. Cotton, for example, was usually marketed through New York, and plantation supplies were purchased there or from Northern agencies in the South. Soil exhaustion and erosion increased with the expansion of agriculture, the causes being the nature of the Southern terrain, improper methods of cultivation, the lack of commercial fertilizer (before 1850), together with the continuous cultivation of the staples on the same land. A more efficient organization and operation of the system was imperative by 1860.

The plantation system with slave labor was destroyed by the Civil War (1861-65) and the decade of Reconstruction^{qv} that followed. Some plantations operated after then on a crop-sharing basis under a centralized authority, e.g., "Dunleith," in the Yazoo-Mississippi delta, others on a wage-labor basis, but the vast majority broke up into small farms, operated by the individual owner, tenant, or cropper.

[U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*; W. B. Hesseltine, *A History of the South, 1607-1936*.]

RALPH B. FLANDERS

Plantations. This term was applied in New England to the system of planting new settlements usually within a colony under the direction of its legislature. It did not originate in New England, for it was already current in Virginia when the Pilgrims applied it to their colony of Plymouth Plantation^{qv}. Still earlier, one finds it used in connection with the efforts of Gilbert and Raleigh to establish plantations or colonies, both in Ireland and in the New World. It came, however, to have a special significance in New England as the Massachusetts trading company merged into the theocracy (*see* Massachusetts Bay Company). Since the charter gave to the company the right to distribute its lands, the government, with its close union of church and state, was able to select suitable leaders for a new planting and bestow upon them the authority to direct the whole enterprise. These leaders received the land for the new settlement in trust; they arranged the business details of the planting; they distributed the land; and organized local government according to instructions given them. Sometimes actual settlement preceded the General Court's authority, but usually the General Court^{qv} was lenient to squatter origin of

settlements, provided it approved of the leaders. This system of authorized and controlled plantations in group units enabled the General Court not only to distribute its growing population and to govern it according to Puritan ideals and standards, but it also provided a frontier system of defense through the planning of buffer settlements. Other New England colonies copied it so that in time it came to be associated particularly with expansion in Puritan New England.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, Vol. I.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

Platforms, Party. Some historians have argued that the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions⁹⁹ constituted the first party platform, but while there were numerous party manifestoes and declarations of principle in the ensuing thirty years, the platform in its modern sense appears in the fourth decade of the 19th century. Since 1840 it has been a regular feature of political campaigns⁹⁹. While state platforms have occasionally thrown considerable light on local controversies, or on sectional divergencies in the national parties, their importance has declined with the rise of the direct primary⁹⁹ and the discrediting of the state conventions.

The platform is the responsibility of a committee of the national convention⁹⁹ and inherits the disadvantages and defects of its creators. While considerable preliminary work has occasionally been given to its preparation, many platforms have shown hasty and careless drafting, a tendency to becloud or evade important issues, and a fondness for turgid rhetoric. On the other hand, controversies over particular issues, like "the gold plank" in the Republican platform of 1896 (see Campaign of 1896), have been of great historical importance.

Platforms have shown the characteristic American tendency to standardization. Eulogy of the founders and past achievements of the party have been a regular feature, continued long after its character and policies would have shocked its earlier leaders. Denunciation of the opposing party is included, and played an important part in the post-Civil War successes of the Republicans. Parties have not hesitated to embarrass the State Department by declarations on domestic issues in foreign countries in the hope of placating or winning the support of groups of foreign-born voters. Opposing platforms frequently have much in common and careful analysis is required to find the real clash of issues. The major parties have invariably contained diverse and sometimes quarrelsome elements, and platform drafters have naturally had to keep this fact constantly in

mind, with the result that they have too often turned out a mass of evasions, political platitudes and inaccurate generalities. The American electorate has long since ceased to attach great importance to the platform, but has come to observe the interpretations and personal declarations of presidential and congressional candidates with increasing interest.

Minor party platforms have a great advantage—a fact which is evident in comparing, for example, the Free Soil and Whig⁹⁹ platforms in 1848 (see Campaign of 1848). The discordant elements in the latter party forced evasion of the major question of the day, the expansion of slavery⁹⁹. The student of both social and political history cannot disregard party platforms, however, as they frequently constitute important sources of evidence of popular thought and eventual legislative action. This is especially true of the minor party platforms, the Greenback, Populist, Prohibition⁹⁹ and other parties writing planks which later became bases of important national policies. The Progressive⁹⁹ platform of 1912 has exercised a decided influence on the domestic policies of both major parties.

[J. P. Gordy, *History of Political Parties in the United States*; C. E. Merriam and H. F. Gosnell, *The American Party System*; H. R. Bruce, *American Parties and Politics*; K. H. Porter, *National Party Platforms*; R. C. Brooks, *Political Parties and Electoral Problems*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Platt Amendment, THE, was the basis for Cuban-American relations from 1901 to 1934. Following the Spanish-American War⁹⁹ the problem of the future relations between the United States and Cuba became a matter of earnest consideration in both countries. For the purpose of finding a solution, Gen. Leonard Wood, upon convening the Cuban constituent assembly on Nov. 5, 1900, instructed it to render an opinion on what the future relations "ought to be." Two unsatisfactory proposals were later submitted, whereupon the United States drew up its own plan. Although the product of many minds, it became known as the Platt Amendment after Sen. Orville H. Platt of Connecticut, chairman of the Senate Committee on Cuban relations. To insure its passage it was attached as a rider to the army appropriations bill for the fiscal year ending June 13, 1902. It contained eight articles, the substance of which were: (I) Cuba was to make no treaty which would impair its independence, nor was it to alienate Cuban territory to a foreign power; (II) Cuba was not to assume or contract any public debt beyond its ability to meet out of "ordinary revenues"; (III) Cuba was to permit the United States "to intervene for the

preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the Treaty of Paris⁹⁹ on the United States now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba"; (IV) all acts of the United States during the occupation were to be validated; (V) Cuba was to continue the sanitation program started by the United States and, if necessary, extend it; (VI) title to the Isle of Pines was to be decided later; (VII) coaling and naval stations chosen by the United States were to be sold or leased; (VIII) the articles were to be embodied in a permanent treaty with the United States.

When the articles were submitted to the Cuban convention with the demand that they be incorporated into the Cuban constitution, a storm of indignation arose. The convention at first refused to agree and sent a delegation to Washington to protest. Particularly objectionable was Article III, which was viewed as depriving Cuba of its sovereign rights. In spite of assurances given by Elihu Root that the United States interpreted its right to intervene as applying only when Cuban independence was threatened by internal anarchy or foreign attack, the convention continued to balk. Not until the United States threatened to remain in the island did the convention, on June 13, 1901, agree to accept it. On May 22, 1903, the articles were written into a formal treaty. The arrangement, never popular in Cuba, aroused increasing bitterness as time went on, especially when later administrations at Washington showed a tendency to ignore the Root interpretation. While armed intervention was seldom resorted to (*see* Cuba, Intervention in, Second, 1906-9; Cuba, Intervention in, Third, 1917-23), there have been numerous occasions when the United States has exerted pressure of some sort. This so-called "intermeddling and interference" strengthened the demand for the repeal of the Platt Amendment, to which the United States acceded on May 29, 1934. Since then the right of the United States to intervene has rested on the general rules of international law⁹⁹.

[Philip G. Wright, *The Cuban Situation and Our Treaty Relations*.]

L. J. MEYER

Platte Bridge Fight, THE, occurred on July 26, 1865, when a large body of Sioux, Cheyenne and Arapahoe⁹⁹⁹ warriors converged in the hills north of the North Platte River, in Colorado, to attack and destroy this important link on the trail to the West. Troops from the adjacent fort

under Lt. Caspar Collins left the post to bring in a wagon train en route from Fort Laramie⁹⁹. Collins and four men were killed, and at a later fight to keep the telegraph lines intact another soldier was killed. The wagon train was wiped out and twenty men accompanying it were slaughtered. The Indians also suffered heavily.

[A. W. Spring, *Caspar Collins*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Platte Purchase, THE, is a tract of almost 2,000,000 acres which extended Missouri's northwest boundary to the Missouri River. It was purchased from the Indians by the Federal Government in 1836 for \$7500 cash together with specified quantities of merchandise, and annexed to Missouri on March 28, 1837. The legislature subsequently divided the region into six counties: Platte and Buchanan (Dec. 31, 1838), Andrew (Jan. 29, 1841), Holt (Feb. 15, 1841), Atchison and Nodaway (Feb. 14, 1845). It comprises about 4% of Missouri's total area; has over 5% of the state's population; and 8% of its wealth, exclusive of St. Louis. St. Joseph, in Buchanan County, with a population of 80,935 in 1930, is Missouri's third largest city.

[H. I. McKee, *The Platte Purchase*, in *Missouri Historical Review*, Vol. XXXII, No. 2.]

HOWARD I. MCKEE

Platte River Trail, THE (1825-69), owed its importance to South Pass⁹⁹, gateway of the Rockies. The Platte heads at the pass, and the most direct route from the pass across 780 miles of plains to the Missouri is down the Platte, which provides water for men and horses. Robert Stuart's Astor Overlanders traversed the route upon their return from Oregon in 1812-13, and Long's Expedition⁹⁹⁹ followed it part way to the Rockies in 1819. A brigade of Ashley's Fur Company⁹⁹ definitely established the trail in 1825 while carrying supplies from the Missouri to trappers in the Rockies. From then on the route was traveled every year by trappers, missionaries and homeseekers. Branches of the trail, with eastern termini on the Missouri at Westport, Fort Leavenworth, Atchison and St. Joseph⁹⁹⁹, all converged on the Platte near Grand Island. In 1843, when a thousand Oregon homeseekers traversed the Platte Trail, they regarded it as merely a part of the Oregon Trail⁹⁹. It also was known as the California Trail, Mormon Trail and Overland Route⁹⁹. The building of the Union Pacific⁹⁹, 1863-69, ended its importance.

[H. M. Chittenden, *The American Fur Trade of the Far West*; Henry Inman, *The Great Salt Lake Trail*.]

BLISS ISELY

Plattsburg, Battle of (Sept. 11, 1814). Sir George Prevost, governor general of Canada, invaded New York with 14,000 veterans, recently arrived from the Duke of Wellington's victorious army in Spain. He was opposed by Gen. Alexander Macomb's 1500 American regulars and 2500 militia, who were strongly entrenched south of the Saranac River in the village of Plattsburg. Macomb's army was supported by a naval squadron of four little ships and ten gunboats under Commander Thomas Macdonough. The British invaders were assisted by another flotilla of about the same size commanded by Capt. George Downie.

Prevost planned a joint attack by land and by sea. He goaded Downie, whose fleet was not fully fitted, into attacking Macdonough who lay at anchor in a well-chosen position in Cumberland Bay. Downie lost his ships and his life in a bloody battle. Macdonough's victory^o was chiefly due to his success in swinging about his flagship, the *Saratoga*, so as to make use of her uninjured broadside. Meanwhile, Prevost failed to fight his way across the Saranac and support Downie. Deprived of naval support, the British army was forced to retreat. Its defeat made peace more certain and cut short British designs of obtaining sole control of the Great Lakes by the peace treaty (*see* Ghent, Treaty of).

[A. T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812*.]

EDWARD P. ALEXANDER

Plattsburg Movement, THE. *See* Citizens' Military Training Camps.

Play Party, THE, was a form of social diversion formerly very common in the hill region of the South. Young people would assemble to play games that were really a form of folk dance to the accompaniment of singing. "Miller Boy," "Down to Rowser's," and "Little Brass Wagon" were common examples.

[B. A. Botkin, *The American Play Party Song*; Vance Randolph, *The Ozark Play-Party*, in *The Journal of American Folk Lore*, Vol. 42, No. 165.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Pleasant Hill, Battle of (April 9, 1864). On the night of April 8, following his unsuccessful fight at Sabine Crossroads^o, Banks (U.) withdrew into strong positions at Pleasant Hill to be ready to unite with the Union fleet in the Red River (*see* Red River Campaign). Late in the afternoon of the 9th, Taylor (C.) attacked Banks. At first successful, the Confederate exposed right flank was turned and the attack repulsed. The troops were thrown into disorder, part of the line being broken and scattered. The Confederate Army

retreated in confusion toward Shreveport. Banks did not pursue, but instead withdrew to the Red River.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. IV.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Plessy v. Ferguson was decided by the Supreme Court in 1896. It involved a Louisiana statute of 1890 requiring railroads to provide "equal but separate accommodations" for both races. Plessy, a mulatto, unsuccessfully challenged the law in the state courts. On appeal the decision was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court. (*See also* "Jim Crow" Laws.)

[Lawrence B. Evans, *Leading Cases on American Constitutional Law*.]

L. J. MEYER

Plough Patent. *See* Lygonia.

Plow, THE. The plows brought from England were crude wooden affairs with share and coulter of wrought iron and a wooden mould board covered with iron plates. When these plows wore out, those made locally were more adapted to the environment. Because of the early shortage of draft animals, plows were of lighter construction, but, because much of the plowing was heavy breaking, attention was paid to improving the shape so that greater efficiency might be obtained without increasing the weight. Through mathematical calculations, such as Jefferson's, the design was bettered and, through the development of the cast iron plow, such improvements were standardized. This step was taken when, in 1817, Jethro Wood's cast iron plow went on sale.

In the heavy, sticky soils of the West, this plow worked badly. The share broke easily and soil clung to the rough, pitted surface. Indeed, the heavy wooden plow was preferable. Sometimes, the westerner plated his plow with the steel of old saw blades to obviate constant scouring.

In 1837 John Deere began his experiments on a steel plow. Ten years later, he had started a factory in Moline, Ill. At first, sheet steel was attached to cast iron, then later a cast steel plow was made. By 1857 prairie farmers were buying 10,000 of these yearly. They were, however, expensive and brittle. The Bessemer process^o reduced the cost, and the development of the chilled steel plow by James Oliver in 1868 increased durability and produced a smooth, hard surface.

Improved harvesting machinery meant a demand for faster plowing. About 1864 the riding, or sulky, plow appeared. Then came the gang plow used on the extensive wheat farms of the West, drawn first by many horses and then by

steam tractors⁹⁹. With the coming of the gasoline tractor, plowing caught up with the harvesting methods.

[P. W. Bidwell and J. I. Falconer, *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860*; Lyman Carrier, *Beginnings of Agriculture in America*, Leo Rogin, *The Introduction of Farm Machinery in Its Relation to the Productivity of Labor in the Agriculture of the United States during the Nineteenth Century*, Albert H. Sanford, *The Story of Agriculture in the United States*.]

ERNEST S. OSGOOD

Plowden's New Albion was the first English colonizing grant of the present New Jersey area, the second in the United States giving religious liberty. Two years after petitions to King Charles I, the New Albion charter was issued June 21, 1634, to nine persons, including Sir Edmund Plowden (1592-1659), soon its sole owner. At their request it claimed title under the Irish crown. It was issued by Strafford, Lord Deputy of Ireland, upon authority from King Charles I, and enrolled in Dublin, where Plowden was stationed when the grant was made. The charter's religious provisions copied those of Lord Baltimore's Maryland: Plowden, of a Shropshire Catholic family, apparently planned New Albion as another Catholic haven.

Plowden tried four times to settle his province. Financial troubles with his wife Mabel, daughter and sole heiress of Peter Marriner, delayed his start several years. On Aug. 30, 1639, Plowden wrote to Lord Baltimore that he would settle in New Albion next spring. Again domestic troubles intervened. In 1641 Plowden's colonizing prospectus appeared, *A Direction for Adventurers to New Albion*. Also, at this time, King Charles I and Parliament requested Gov. Berkeley in Virginia to help Plowden settle his province on the Delaware, the Swedes having now been established there four years (see New Sweden, The Colony of). In August, 1642, just as the Civil War began in England, Plowden sailed with his colonists to Virginia where they spent the winter. The articles of his indentured settlers specified service in New Albion. Their predominant religion is not yet known.

Early in May, 1643, a party of Plowden's people, while sailing with him outside Chesapeake Bay, apparently en route to settle his province, successfully mutinied against him, as recorded by the Swedish governor, Printz. Legal records thereafter indicate Plowden resided continuously in Virginia, reportedly hopeful of more settlers in spite of the English Civil War. In the spring of 1648, he sailed to England, reporting at New Amsterdam and to Gov. Winthrop in Boston his intention to return to America and "dispossess the Swedes."

Pluggy's Band

In December, 1648, there was published in England, *A Description of the Province of New Albion*, with a long foreword signed "Beauchamp Plantagenet." This prospectus fancifully described New Albion; detailed with considerable accuracy the New Albion charter, Virginia, and Plowden's life, and reprinted the 1641 *Direction*. Plowden's third colonizing attempt, a large project, now developed Last minute lawsuits blocked it in April, 1649. In 1650 "Plantagenet's" *Description* was reprinted, slightly revised, and on June 11, 1650, Cromwell's Council of State issued a pass to New Albion for "seven score persons." This last venture collapsed, doubtless from political pressure, for it had been planned, after Cromwell's triumphs, as a Royalist asylum.

Numerous land suits kept Plowden in England until his death in 1659. He was buried July 20, that year, at St. Clement Danes, London. He had made his second son his heir, and additional confusion arose when the New Albion charter document became lost. Consequently, no Plowden contested King Charles II's grant of these lands to the Duke of York in 1664. In 1772 chance disclosed the enrollment of Plowden's charter in Dublin. Francis Plowden, Sir Edmund's great-great-grandson, immediately but vainly petitioned King George III for restoration of the province. In 1784 he sent to America an agent, Charles Varlo, whose recovery efforts also failed.

[For a short article with many citations to original material see Some Recently Discovered Extracts from the Lost Minutes of the Virginia Council and General Court, 1642-1645, together with Notes on Sir Edmund Plowden, by Clifford Lewis 3rd, in *William and Mary Quarterly*, January, 1940. For a more detailed account, but lacking certain original material recently discovered, see *Some Notes on Sir Edmund Plowden and His Province of New Albion*, by Clifford Lewis 3rd, available at John Carter Brown Library, University of Virginia, William and Mary College, and Historical Society of Pennsylvania.]

CLIFFORD LEWIS 3RD

Pluggy's Band. Capt. Pluggy was a Mohawk Indian who gathered about himself a band of renegades, chiefly Mingo or Iroquois⁹⁹. They removed to the Ohio country and by 1772 had a village on what was later known as Mingo Bottom⁹⁹, near the present Steubenville. In 1773 Pluggy's band removed to the waters of the Scioto; there they joined the Shawnee in Dunmore's War⁹⁹. In 1775 they made peace with the Americans at the Treaty of Pittsburgh⁹⁹, but went on the warpath against the Kentucky settlers in 1776. Pluggy was killed in December, but his band continued their depredations. In March, 1777, Virginia ordered an expedition of militia against the band. Congress, however, in April,

rescinded the order, fearing to bring on a general Indian war. Meanwhile, after their leader's death, the band disintegrated.

[R. G. Thwaites and L. P. Kellogg, *Revolution on the Upper Ohio*.]

LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG

Plumb Plan, THE, of public ownership of railroads to replace the Railway Administration⁷⁰ after the World War, was proposed by Glenn E. Plumb, counsel for the organized railway employees, and considered in Congress in 1919 as the Sims Bill. It was proposed that railroad properties be purchased at a government-appraised value subject to judicial review, and operated by a quasi-public corporation representing the Government, operators and classified employees; and that improvements be financed by Federal and local funds, and profits used to retire the public bonds, reduce rates and increase railway wages. (See also Transportation Act of 1920.)

[Articles by Glenn E. Plumb in *The Public*, April 26, 1919; *The Nation*, July 19, Aug. 16, 1919; and *The Independent*, Aug. 30, 1919.]

MARTIN P. CLAUSSEN

Plumbing. The first colonists, who arrived in this country in the early 17th century, brought with them the sanitary practices, but little of the equipment, known at that time. Early tubs and other fixtures were more primitive than already known fixtures in other parts of the world, but the ingenuity of the pioneers enabled the plumbing industry to forge ahead rapidly.

Wooden tubs and troughs were the bathtubs of early Americans. There was no running water, either hot or cold. The all-purpose fireplace or stove heated the water. Inasmuch as there were no drains, after the bathing event, the water was laboriously dipped out. Later, boxes were constructed of wood and lined with lead or tin. These might more properly be termed bathtubs, as they were used exclusively for bathing, while the earlier wooden tubs served for washing, and other purposes.

Most manufactured goods had to be imported and were costly. England, however, furnished the wealthier colonists with porcelain bowls, pitchers and pots. Later, even solid porcelain tubs were imported from England. Copper vessels and bowls for sanitary purposes were also manufactured in Europe and imported by some colonists.

Benjamin Franklin brought back from France a copper tub, known as the slipper bath, shaped like a huge copper shoe. A fire under the "heel" heated the water, and over this was a seat for the bather. The water was poured into the tub by hand, but had a drain at the "toe." Early tubs

were constructed so as to expose the bather as little as possible, for, due to the inadequate heating facilities, untimely drafts might produce serious illness. This fact is doubtless responsible for the lack of enthusiasm for bathing—except possibly in summer—prevalent among various classes during the 17th and 18th centuries.

The early Presidents of the United States enjoyed no better bathing facilities than the ordinary citizen, being dependent upon the Potomac River. When new executive offices were built in the time of Jefferson, stipulation was made only for the "necessary outhouses." As early as 1813 there was running water in Washington, but, while the White House had a separate room established as the bathroom, it did not have running water. During the Andrew Jackson era running water was introduced for the first time in the kitchen and pantries, and for hot and cold shower baths.

When Cleveland was President, he insisted on two bathrooms. Theodore Roosevelt modernized the executive mansion to include ten bathrooms, and the total now (1939) is fifteen bathrooms, and a swimming pool.

Where there was no running water installed, there was also no sewage disposal system. That the United States might not follow the disastrous history of plagues which bound Europe and Asia to poverty and devastating diseases, some form of sewerage system had to be devised. It was not until 1856, however, that a real city sewerage system was constructed. This was in Chicago. Typhoid⁷¹ was then a common disease, and in spite of the improved sewage disposal system continued to be common up until the early part of the 20th century.

In 1612 the plumbers' guild in England was chartered by the College of Heralds of London. It is not known who was the first American plumber, or if he was a member of the English plumbers' guild. The idea of organization, however, for the improvement of sanitary conditions, training of apprentices and protection of the trade persisted, and in 1883 in New York City the National Association of Master Plumbers, Inc., was organized. It is the oldest and largest master craftsmen's organization in the country.

Today (1939) plumbing fixtures are installed by more than 100,000 journeymen plumbers who are employed by 35,000 plumbing contractors. The products of about 500 manufacturers of plumbing fixtures, pipe, valves, fittings and accessories are distributed by nearly 2000 wholesalers.

[Plumbing and Heating Industries Bureau, *America Leads in Sanitation*, and *The Origin and Improvement of the*

Bathtub in the United States; Ethel Lewis, *The White House*; Walter Davenport, *All Washed Up*, in *The Mentor*, March, 1930; Leonora R. Baxter, *Bathing through the Ages*, *The Golden Book*, September, 1930.]

NORMAN J. RADDER

Plummer Gang. Henry Plummer, elected sheriff of Bannack District (now Montana) May 24, 1863, organized a band of fifty outlaws, called "The Innocents," against whom 102 murders are charged. A Vigilance Committee, with which Wilbur Fisk Sanders, later senator, was associated, was formed in December, 1863, and within six weeks hanged most of the band. Among thirty-three executions was that of the notorious Joseph A. Slade.

[Hoffman Birney, *Vigilantes*.]

DON RUSSELL

Plymouth, The Virginia Company of (1606-20), was one of the two companies incorporated in the first Virginia charter of 1606. In 1605 a group of men representing the City of London and the outports of Bristol, Plymouth and Exeter petitioned for a charter which would accord them the privilege of planting colonies in America. Though the petitioners were men bound by the ties of relationship, friendship or common interest, the rivalry between London and the outports was such that the leaders wished to proceed with the project under separate companies. The charter of 1606 therefore created two companies, the Virginia Company of London^o, with permission to plant a colony in southern Virginia between the 34th and the 41st degrees of northern latitude, to be called the First Colony of Virginia, and the Virginia Company of Plymouth, whose plantation, to be called the Second Colony of Virginia, was to be located to the north between the 38th and 45th degrees of latitude, the overlapping area to be considered a neutral zone in which the colonies could not come within one hundred miles of each other.

The Plymouth Company, like the London Company, was to be under the jurisdiction of the royal council for Virginia, but had its own resident council of thirteen as government for its projected plantation. The enterprise was commercial in character, but to what extent the company could control the trade of its colony is not clear in the charter. The leaders in the Plymouth Company were Sir John Popham, an old man of seventy-five, and Sir Ferdinando Gorges, who became the mainstay of the enterprise after the death of Popham in February, 1608.

The Plymouth Company sent out its first expedition in the summer of 1606 to seek a place for a plantation. Unfortunately the vessel was captured by the Spanish near Puerto Rico where

it was driven by adverse winds, and the men carried off as prisoners to Spain from where a few of them made their way back to Plymouth with difficulty. A second vessel dispatched in the autumn of 1606 reached the coast of Maine in safety, and returned with such glowing accounts that the company sent out two ships in May, 1607, the *Gift of God* and the *Mary and John*, carrying settlers. A plantation was begun near the mouth of the Sagadahoc, but from the outset it did not prosper. Gorges ascribed its failure to an insufficiency of food supplies and "childish factions." The men were apparently not of the right type, lacking the self-discipline and the will to work, necessary to all pioneer ventures. The winter cold, the burning of the storehouse and many dwellings, and consequent shortage of supplies weakened the interest of the planters, while the death of some of the leaders, including Popham, discouraged the company in England from pushing the enterprise further (see Popham Colony). Some of its members, however, continued their interest in the fisheries and sent out several expeditions to fish and trade with the Indians. Profits from these activities were sufficient to convince men like Gorges of the potentialities of the region, and thus to pave the way for the reorganization of the project in 1620 under the new company, the Council for New England^o.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period in America*, Vol. I.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

Plymouth Plantation. See New Plymouth, The Colony of.

Plymouth Rock. There is no contemporary record that the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock when they disembarked on Dec. 11 (Dec. 21, New Style^o), 1620, and it is not known who first set foot on the rock. Thacher states, on the authority of "the late venerable Deacon [Ephraim] Spooner," that when the latter was a boy, about the year 1741, he saw "Elder [Thomas] Faunce," then ninety-five years old, identify the present Plymouth Rock as that on which, according to his father (John Faunce, who came in the *Ann* in 1623), the Pilgrims landed. This tradition is accepted by Winsor and later historians. Ann Taylor wrote in 1773 that her grandmother, Mary Chilton, was the first to step on the rock and a similar tradition persists regarding John Alden, but Winsor states that they both landed at a later date. The rock has been moved back from its original location in order to better protect and display it.

[James Thacher, *History of the Town of Plymouth*; Justin Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*;

Annie Russell Marble, *The Women Who Came in the Mayflower*; W. T. Davis, *Ancient Landmarks of Plymouth*.]

R. W. G. VAIL

Plymouth Trading Post. In 1632 Edward Winslow of the Plymouth Colony^W visited the Connecticut Valley to discover the possibilities of trade. After vain efforts to enlist the co-operation of the Massachusetts Bay Colony^W in the enterprise, Winslow, then governor of Plymouth, sent Lt. William Holmes to occupy the site he had selected for a trading post. Holmes sailed past the threatening Dutch who had established their House of Hope^W three months earlier, and, with ready-made materials which he had brought, set up a trading post at the junction of the Farmington River with the Connecticut, Sept. 26, 1633. Traders and settlers from the Bay Colony began to enter the valley the next year and in 1635 located near the post, which was in charge of Jonathan Brewster. The Plymouth people soon found themselves crowded out and on May 15, 1637, sold their claims to all except the trading post and a small parcel of land to the Massachusetts settlers of Windsor (*see River Towns of Connecticut*).

[F. S. M. Crofut, *Guide to the History and Historic Sites of Connecticut*.]

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

"Pocket, The." The southwestern portion of Indiana, embracing ten counties within the area bounded by the Ohio, the Wabash, the White and Blue rivers has long been called "the pocket" from its pendulous geographical relation to the rest of the state. (*See also Gore.*) Occasionally the southwesternmost congressional district, usually Democratic, is so designated. A letter of Robert Dale Owen to William H. English, March 1, 1851, indicates a common usage of the term at that time.

[T. J. De La Hunt, *The Pocket in Indiana History*, in *Ind. Mag. of Hist.*, XVI.]

HARVEY L. CARTER

Pocket Veto is the action of the President in suppressing unacceptable legislation with no opportunity of repassage. The Constitution^W provides that measures presented to the President within ten days of adjournment, and not signed, fail to become law. It is a method of influence utilized by twenty Presidents. It has grown in popularity from its first usage by Madison. Up to 1865 only twenty-one measures were pocketed by six of the sixteen Presidents. Every veto President since Pierce has used this method. Of 733 pocket vetoes down to December, 1939, 349 have been recorded since 1901. Eight Presidents pocketed more measures than they returned disapproved.

[Report on Pocket Veto, *House Document No. 493*, 70th Cong. 2nd sess.; The Pocket Veto Case, 279 U. S. 655, 1929.]

GEORGE C. ROBINSON

Point Barrow, Alaska, the most northerly portion of North America (lat. 71° 23' north, long. 156° 40' west), was discovered by H.M.S. *Blossom* in August, 1826. It is a rendezvous for arctic and whaling fleets, a source of coal and oil, and the site of a United States meteorological and relief station.

[H. W. Clark, *History of Alaska*; F. G. Carpenter, *Alaska: Our Northern Wonderland*.]

J. W. ELLISON

Point Pleasant, The Battle of (Oct. 10, 1774), was one of the most notable conflicts between Indians and frontiersmen in the annals of the West (*see Dunmore's War*). Col. Andrew Lewis with about 1100 men from the frontier of southwest Virginia marching 160 miles from Camp Union, on the levels of Greenbrier, to join Gov. Dunmore on the Ohio, arrived at the mouth of the Great Kanawha, Oct. 6, where they made camp in the point of the two rivers called Point Pleasant.

While resting and recruiting the men, and awaiting the arrival of Col. William Christian with 250 of the rear guard, Lewis' army was attacked early in the morning by a large force of Shawnee^W, led by Chief Cornstalk, which had crossed the Ohio in the night. Lewis sent out two divisions under his brother, Col. Charles Lewis, and Col. William Fleming; both officers were soon wounded, the former fatally. The Indians fought desperately, hoping to drive the whites into the rivers. The fighting was in frontier fashion, individual combats, sheltering behind trees and logs.

About one o'clock the Indians grew discouraged, but continued desultory fighting until sunset, when they withdrew across the Ohio. The losses on both sides were heavy, the Virginians having nearly fifty killed and twice that number wounded. The losses of the Indians were never known.

The effect of the battle was to break the power of the Shawnee, who soon met Gov. Dunmore and made a treaty with him (*see Charlotte, Treaty of Camp*). This treaty saved the West from the horrors of Indian warfare during the first years of the American Revolution. The battle was a victory of colonial troops without support of regulars. Most of the officers and men soon enrolled in the Revolutionary forces that opposed Great Britain.

[R. G. Thwaites and L. P. Kellogg, *Dunmore's War*.]

LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG

Pointe Coupée, on the west bank of the Mississippi just below the mouth of Red River, was an early French settlement in Louisiana. It quickly became one of the more important French posts and remained such until the end of the French regime. Many Acadianssm settled there during the Spanish regime and its population is still predominantly French.

[Alcée Fortier, *Louisiana*, Cyclopedic, and *History of Louisiana*; Henry E. Chambers, *History of Louisiana*; Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Pokagon Village, of the St. Joseph River Potawatomi Indians, was situated in what is now Bertrand Township, Berrien County, Mich. Not far from the site of the old St. Joseph Mission, this village became the center of the revived Catholic missions of the region when Father Stephen T. Badin was appointed resident missionary in 1830.

[C. B. Beuchner, *The Pokagons*, in *Indiana Historical Society Publication*, Vol. X; W. M. McNamara, *The Catholic Church on the Northern Indiana Frontier*.]

THOMAS T. McAVOY

Poker as the great American indoor sport had its rise toward the middle of the 19th century, reaching its glory in the boom times following the Civil War. The chances it offers, enough science balancing chance to make it a smart man's game, the exciting situations, the taut crises, the readiness with which it may be learned, its adaptability to any number of players brought together by chance, the bluffs it makes possible and the poker face it makes a virtue—all suited the flush times in Alabama, the boom times in California, the roaring times all over the nation when railroads, factories, ranching and other occupations were taking over an empire and making millionaires out of poor boys almost over night. It has been the game for a people who won't settle with beer or effervesce with wine but demand whiskey straight. Jim Smiley's hearty eagerness to "take a chance on anything"—in Mark Twain's *Jumping Frog of Calaveras County*—expresses the poker spirit of America.

Poker players like Bret Harte's Mr. Oakhurst (in *The Outcasts of Poker Flat*) and Cherokee Hall (in A. H. Lewis' *Wolfville* books) express the professional poker gambler, a type as familiar on Mississippi River steamboats as in Roaring Camp.

[G. H. Devol, *Forty Years a Gambler*; John Philip Quinn, *Fools of Fortune*.]

J. FRANK DOBIE

Polar Cruise of the *Jeannette* (1879-81). In 1879 J. G. Bennett of the New York *Herald* dispatched the *Jeannette* under Lt. G. W. DeLong

Polar Expeditions

to try for the Pole by way of Bering Strait. DeLong sailed through the strait, soon became caught in the ice, drifted for twenty-one months, and foundered in lat. 77° 15', long. 155° E. He made his way with three boats to the New Siberian Islands, then tried to reach the Lena River. The boats became separated: one was lost, another reached the Lena, the third under DeLong reached land, but DeLong and his men all perished of starvation.

[Emma DeLong, *The Voyage of the Jeannette*; George W. Melville, *In the Lena Delta*, Edward Ellsberg, *Hell on Ice*.]

N. M. CROUSE

Polar Expeditions. The attempt to reach the North Pole began for the same reason as the search for the Northwest Passagesm, that is, to find a route to Asia for purposes of trade. Robert Thorne in 1527 urged Henry VIII to seek a route in this direction, believing that a fairly warm climate existed around the Pole which caused an open sea. This belief was later revived by the Dutch geographer, Peter Plancius; and under his influence Henry Hudson set out for the Pole in 1607. He sailed up the eastern coast of Greenland to the ice barrier and skirted it eastward to Spitsbergen. Jan C. May (1611-12) was sent out by the States-General to make a similar attempt and reached 77° 45' off Nova Zembla.

The idea of an open Polar Sea lay in abeyance for many years until one Daines Barrington, an English lawyer who had collected a vast amount of data, more or less fictitious, about whaling vessels in high latitudes, succeeded in convincing the Royal Society that success lay in this direction. The Society, in turn, induced the Admiralty in 1773 to send out Capt. C. J. Phipps with the *Racehorse* and *Carcass*. Phipps proceeded to Spitsbergen and attained latitude 80° 48' when he was turned back by the ice. William Scoresby in 1806 went out with the whaling fleet and forced his way through the ice barrier to 81° 30'. His son in 1817 reported a breaking up of the great barrier, and the Admiralty at once sent David Buchan (1818) in the *Dorothea* and *Trent* to try his luck. He managed to reach 80° 34' before the damage to his flagship caused him to retreat. On returning from his Northwest exploits Sir Edward Parry in 1827 took his ship the *Hecla* to Spitsbergen and attempted to reach the Pole with boats mounted on steel runners. He did well and attained 82° 45', a "farthest north" that held for many years.

The search for Sir John Franklin renewed interest in Polar exploration. E. A. Inglefield (English) decided to look for Franklin by way of Smith Sound, north of Baffin Bay, which he hoped

would lead to an open sea. With the *Isabel*, in 1852, he penetrated the sound to $78^{\circ} 28'$, opening the way for other explorers in this direction. Elisha K. Kane, sent out by the United States in 1853, followed this route and brought his ship to $78^{\circ} 45'$. William Morton, his assistant, proceeded by sledge to Cape Constitution ($80^{\circ} 40'$) on the northern coast of Greenland. Dr. I. I. Hayes, Kane's lieutenant, was sent (1860-61) in the ship *United States* to follow this line of exploration. Making his headquarters at Port Foulke he proceeded to Lady Franklin Bay in Grinnell Land, latitude $81^{\circ} 35'$.

The route through Smith Sound now became the orthodox one. In 1871 the United States sent out Charles F. Hall in the *Polaris*. He discovered the Robeson Channel and reached latitude $82^{\circ} 11'$. The British government dispatched Sir George S. Nares in 1875, accompanied by A. H. Markham and Lt. Parr with the *Discovery* and *Alert*. The *Alert* went north of the Robeson Channel to $82^{\circ} 27'$. The following year Markham and Parr proceeded by sledge over the ice and made the "farthest north" of $83^{\circ} 20'$. In 1882 A. W. Greely was sent to command the American circumpolar station at Lady Franklin Bay. His lieutenant, J. B. Lockwood, attained Lockwood Island off Greenland, latitude $83^{\circ} 24'$.

Meanwhile, a Norwegian, Fridtjof Nansen, had determined to try for the Pole by drifting across it in the Arctic currents. In a vessel, the *Fram*, especially constructed to withstand ice pressure, he left Norway in 1893 for the New Siberian Islands where he entered the ice-pack. Two years later he quitted the ship, with Frederik Johansen, and made a dash for the Pole by sledge. They attained $86^{\circ} 5'$. Eventually they reached Jackson Island near which they were found by a relief expedition the following year. The *Fram* presently returned to Norway.

A novel way of reaching the Pole was devised by the Swedish scientist, S. A. Andrée. He proposed to drift across it in a balloon. In 1897 he left Spitsbergen and was never heard of again. Years later, in 1930, remains of his camp were found on White Island. From his diaries we learn that he reached $82^{\circ} 56'$ before his balloon collapsed, and that he made his way to the island by sledge. The Duke of Abruzzi fitted out the *Stella Polare* in 1899 and proceeded to Rudolf Island. Personally disabled here he dispatched Capt. Cagni the following year by sledge over the ice. He reached latitude $86^{\circ} 34'$.

In 1898 the Peary Arctic Club dispatched the experienced explorer, Robert E. Peary², U. S. N., to find the Pole. Sailing up Baffin Bay Peary wintered at Cape d'Urville and spent the following

year exploring Ellesmere and Grinnell Lands. In 1900 he reached Cape Morris K. Jesup in northern Greenland whence he struck out over the ice, only to be turned back at latitude $83^{\circ} 52'$. He then made his headquarters in Grant Land, and two years later renewed his attempt to reach the Pole from Cape Hecla and did attain $84^{\circ} 17'$. On his return to the United States his encouraging reports led the Club to back him again, and in 1905 he proceeded, in the specially constructed *Roosevelt*, to Cape Sheridan, Grant Land, where he spent the winter. Getting off to an early start with Capt. R. A. Bartlett he got as far as $87^{\circ} 6'$ the following spring. In 1908 he again came to Cape Sheridan in the *Roosevelt*, and in February started from Cape Columbia for the Pole. On reaching $87^{\circ} 47'$ Bartlett, the last of his white companions, was sent back, and Peary continued with only his Negro servant, Matthew Henson, and four Eskimos. He reached the Pole on April 6, 1909.

The first attempt to get to the Pole by aeroplane was made in 1925 when Roald Amundsen³ and Lincoln Ellsworth started from King's Bay, Spitsbergen on May 21 with two planes. After several hours of successful flying they landed in open water to take observations, and found themselves in latitude $87^{\circ} 44'$. Unfortunately the ice closed in, making it impossible to start the planes. Caught in this predicament they attacked the problem courageously. After a month of ceaseless effort they succeeded in freeing one plane in which they managed to return to their base.

The following year (1926) saw two successful flights to the Pole. Richard E. Byrd⁴, U. S. N., and Floyd Bennett left King's Bay in the *Josephine Ford* on May 9 and made the round trip in only sixteen hours. Two days later Amundsen, Ellsworth and Gen. Umberto Nobile started from the same base in the Italian-built dirigible *Norge*, crossed the Pole, and continued on their journey to Teller, Alaska, which they reached in seventy-two hours.

In 1928 Gen. Nobile brought the dirigible *Italia* to Spitsbergen and started for the Pole on May 23. He succeeded in reaching it without mishap, but on his return journey his ship was wrecked off North East Land not far from Spitsbergen. After considerable difficulty search parties, proceeding by sea and by air, managed to rescue him and most of his crew.

[*Andrée's Story*; Duke of Abruzzi, *On the "Polar Star"*; Nellis M. Crouse, *The Search for the Northwest Passage*; C. H. Davis, *Narrative of the North Polar Expedition*; A. W. Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*; I. I. Hayes, *The Open Polar Sea*; E. K. Kane, *Arctic Explorations*; Jeanette Mirsky, *To the North!*; Fridtjof Nansen, *Farthest*

North; G. S. Nares, *Narrative of a Voyage to the Polar Sea*; R. E. Scoresby-Jackson, *Life of William Scoresby*; Amundsen and Ellsworth, *Our Polar Flight*, and *First Crossing of the Polar Sea*, Richard E. Byrd, *Exploring with Byrd*; Davide Giudici, *The Tragedy of the Italia*, Fitzhugh Green, *Peary, the Man Who Refused to Fail*, Robert E. Peary, *Nearest the Pole*, and *The North Pole*.]

N. M. CROUSE

Poles and Pole Raisings. The "Liberty Tree" was an elm in Boston upon which effigies of Stamp Act⁹⁷ officials were hung in 1765. It became a rallying center for rebellious citizens, and artificial liberty trees, i.e., poles, were set up in other towns. The one erected by the Sons of Liberty⁹⁸ on the Common in New York, "a pine post where they daily exercise, called by them the Tree of Liberty," was soon felled by British soldiers. Six in all were reared there, all save the last being destroyed by the soldiery, sometimes amid riotous scenes. The fifth (January, 1770) was heavily banded with iron near its base, and deeply planted, yet the soldiers succeeded in throwing it down, which brought on the battle of Golden Hill⁹⁹. Pole raisings thereafter, until long after the Revolution, were enthusiastic ceremonies, and the pole—gradually developed into a flag-pole and sometimes crowned with a liberty cap¹⁰⁰—was a patriotic rallying place for the community.

[George Bancroft, *History of the United States*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Police. While ordinary citizens have power to make arrests for felonies committed in their presence, the term "police" is usually reserved for application to full or part time public employees who are sworn to enforce the law. The earliest police in America were the counterparts of their British models. Sheriffs and constables served the rural and urban areas. City police did not appear until after the organization of Peel's London "Bobbies" in 1829. New York City followed in 1844, and by the middle of the century police were common. State police forces were slow to develop. The first force of this type was the Texas Rangers¹⁰¹, organized in 1835. State police with general jurisdiction to enforce state laws now exist in twenty-two states. In twenty-two more there are state highway patrols with power to enforce motor vehicle laws on the state highways. The operatives of the Secret Service of the United States Treasury Department, the United States Post Office inspectors and the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice¹⁰² form the nucleus of a growing national police force. When needed, the military forces may also be used to quell domes-

Police Power

tic disorder by giving assistance to the civil police authorities

[Harvey Walker, *Public Administration in the United States*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Police Power is the power to govern inherent in every sovereign state. In the United States it is the authority of a state to make and enforce laws for the protection and promotion of the health, safety, morals, welfare and convenience of its inhabitants. It ranks with taxation and eminent domain¹⁰³ as one of the fundamental powers reserved to the states by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution¹⁰⁴. Through its exercise individual liberty may be restrained in the interests of social welfare. But there are limits to its proper use. Some appear in state constitutions, but the most far reaching are those of the equal protection, due process and privilege and immunities clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment¹⁰⁵.

The police power may be exercised by the state itself, through the passage of state statutes. Examples of typical police power regulations include laws licensing professions and trades, controlling the manufacture and sale of explosives, intoxicating liquors and other substances which might be detrimental to public health, safety or morals; suppression of gambling and vice; quarantine regulations; control over rates and service of public utilities; protecting fish and game; conserving forest and mineral resources, and many others.

The state may delegate authority to enact and enforce police power regulations to cities, villages and other municipal corporations. Traffic ordinances, abatement of nuisances, zoning the use of private real estate, licensing of pool halls, soft drink parlors, and many other regulations, designed to make living in urban areas more comfortable and agreeable to the majority of the people, are common examples of the exercise of this power.

The Supreme Court of the United States has on a number of occasions denied that the National Government possesses any police power. But eminent scholars have pointed out that many Federal laws such as the Pure Food and Drug Act and the Meat Inspection Act of 1906¹⁰⁶, the law against the interstate transportation of lottery tickets and prize fight films, laws and rules denying the use of the mails to obscene literature and many others are analogous to the police power regulations of the states. It seems pedantic to insist that since they are authorized by or implied from express powers of Congress, they are not an exercise of the police power.

[Rodney L. Mott, *Due Process of Law*; Ernst Freund,

The Police Power; R. E. Cushman, *Studies in the Police Power of the National Government.*] HARVEY WALKER

Police Strike, Boston. See Boston Police Strike.

Political Assessments of officeholders and of office seekers have been for over a century an important source of campaign funds (see Campaign Resources and Uses). For many years it was the chief source, being especially effective in state and in city politics. As an element of the spoils system⁹⁹, public offices are part of the liquid assets of the political machine. Officeholders and office seekers have a direct and vital interest in the success of their organization in the direct primary⁹⁹ and of their party in the election. They know that the high cost of conducting campaigns and the frequent elections necessitate large funds if the party machinery is to function effectively. In practical politics, assessments are defended as a form of insurance for the securing or the holding of jobs. The assessment of officeholders is systematic; they are expected to contribute according to a regular scale which has been established. This scale is usually a definite percentage levied on the annual salary of the incumbent, ranging from 1% to 5%. There is thus assured a fixed and easily collected party revenue. The contributions may be voluntary in form; in reality, they are more or less mandatory and are so recognized. Failure to contribute may well mean the loss of position or other political reprisal, such as demotion or failure of promotion. The assessment of candidates is regulated by their financial status and by the character of the office sought. Portions of the funds collected under actual or fancied duress are often retained for personal use by party workers. In 1883 Federal legislation forbade any officer or employee of the United States from soliciting or receiving any "assessment, subscription, or contribution, for any political purpose whatever" from any officer or employee of the United States (see Pendleton Act, The). Publicity and civil service rules against enforced levies have made the statute reasonably successful, although many Federal officeholders contribute to state and local organizations. Seventeen states prohibit by law the political assessment of officeholders; a few make it illegal to solicit contributions from candidates. Although not completely eradicated, the former abuses are less flagrant. The issue has been presented in new and difficult form by the recent and rapid increase of Federal employees in relief⁹⁹ and other agencies. Modern and successful variations of the practice include assessments for dinners, dances and other quasi-political celebrations, the surplus going to the party treasury.

[L. Overacker, *Money in Elections*; J. K. Pollock, *Party Campaign Funds*; E. R. Sikes, *State and Federal Corrupt Practices Legislation.*]

THOMAS S. BARCLAY

Political Campaigns. See Campaigns, Political; and separate articles on each of the presidential Campaigns.

Political Contributions. See Campaign Resources and Uses; Political Assessments.

Political Exiles to the United States. The United States has been the traditional haven for the politically oppressed of the world since 1562 when the first expedition of Huguenots⁹⁹ reached Florida. The great Puritan exodus to Massachusetts beginning in 1630 and the equally great Cavalier exodus to Virginia in 1649 established two political exile colonies in the New World of opposite political faiths—the former republican, the latter monarchical in sympathy. Each in turn exiled its own dissenters so that secondary exile plantings developed in Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, North Carolina and part of Maryland. Pennsylvania welcomed the English Quakers and the Palatine exiles⁹⁹ in the latter part of the 17th century. At about the same time South Carolina and New York became places of refuge for French Huguenots.

The 18th century brought to Pennsylvania Swiss Mennonites in 1710, Dunkards in 1719, and Schwenkfelders in 1733⁹⁹—all politically persecuted for their religious beliefs. Georgia became the home of the Salzburger⁹⁹ exiles after 1734. Congress granted a tract of land in central Ohio for Canadian refugees who had assisted the American cause in the Revolution and could not return to their homes (see Refugee Tract). Following Toussaint L'Ouverture's Black Uprising in 1790, South Carolina became the major haven for French refugees from Haiti. After the French Revolution, many of the persecuted nobility came to the United States (see Castorland Company; also Champ d'Asile).

In the 19th century we received the "Burschenschaften" refugees from Germany—those members of German student societies who were driven out for their political liberalism in 1817–20. Moreover, after the unsuccessful Polish uprising against Russia in 1830, Congress granted thirty-six sections of public land in Illinois or Michigan to this particular group of exiled Polish noblemen. The socialist revolutions that swept over Europe in 1848 resulted in new exiles who sought our protection. Of these, the German "forty-eighters"⁹⁹ were the most numerous. Louis Kossuth⁹⁹ and his Hungarian exiles were warmly welcomed by Congress and country (see New

Buda). Russian pogroms against the Jews⁹⁹ started in earnest in the 1880's and periodically thereafter we have received masses of exiled Russian Jews.

In the 20th century, political revolutions in Latin America have contributed an increasing toll of exiles to the United States—particularly from Cuba and Mexico. Sentiment in the United States was sympathetic to the White Russians—intelligentsia and nobility for the most part—who were exiled after the Communist Revolution in 1917. Following Mussolini's March on Rome in 1922 we admitted from Italy some anti-Fascist exiles—mostly political liberals. More recently Jews and liberals exiled from Germany by the Hitler Revolution of 1933 and the Austrian Anschluss of 1938 have sought admittance to this country.

[Francis J. Brown, ed., *Refugees*, in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 203, May, 1939.]

FRANCES L. REINHOLD

Political Parties. Modern democratic states have developed innumerable voluntary organizations which endeavor to influence government. Among these various "pressure groups"⁹⁹ the political party is distinguished by the fact that it makes nominations to public office. In addition to this basically characteristic function the political party also as a rule formulates principles and policies in platforms⁹⁹ which are put forth as superior to all others for the conduct of government; it wages campaigns for the election of its candidates; finally, if successful at the polls, it brings influence to bear upon officeholders to secure the realization of its principles and policies. For the defeated party, of course, the latter function is transformed into that of opposition to the activities of the party in power.

In spite of the progress made by democratic ideas toward the end of the 18th century the view then prevailing of political parties, for which indeed abundant historical evidence could be quoted, was that they were incorrigibly violent, destructive, oppressive and corrupt. Much chicane and dishonesty have marred their record since; nevertheless on the whole the contemporary view is that parties are peaceful, constructive and absolutely essential to the successful conduct of a democratic state.

Regardless of the prejudice against them, loosely organized parties existed in the American colonies from the latter part of the 17th century onward. Chief among them were the Tories and the Whigs, who with the advent of the Revolution came to be known respectively as Loyalists and Patriots⁹⁹. Later during the controversy over

the Constitution the Large State (also known as the National or Federalist) group which was loose-constructionist in its views, opposed the Small State (also called the Anti-Federalist or Confederate) group which held to strict construction. Subsequent to the adoption of the Constitution the party history of the United States may be divided into three periods during the greater part of which two major parties were pitted against each other.

(I) From 1789 to 1824 the Federalists⁹⁹, who were directly descended from the Large State group, opposed the Republicans (Jeffersonian)⁹⁹, who derived from the Small State group. In general, the former accepted the doctrines of Hamilton, the latter those of Jefferson. The Federalist party was supported principally by commercial and industrial elements, the Republican party by the agrarian element. Following Jefferson's election in 1800 the Federalists went down hill steadily; in 1820 they made no nomination for the Presidency. Shunning at first the title "democratic" as smacking of the French Revolution the party of Jefferson came to be known later as the Democratic-Republican party. Toward the end of this period during the so-called "era of good feeling,"⁹⁹ which was really an era of intense personal politics, voters generally accepted the Republican label but they followed various leaders—Adams, Clay and Calhoun; Crawford, Clinton and Jackson.

(II) From 1824 to 1860 the two principal parties were the Whigs⁹⁹, earlier known as National Republicans, who accepted the Federalist tradition largely and were supported by the same classes plus the rising manufacturing element then chiefly centered in New England. Jackson fused the Democratic⁹⁹ elements, no longer fearful to be called by that name, who were powerfully reinforced by Western settlers and newly enfranchised laborers in the older parts of the country. Minor political groups, some of them mere factions confined to one or a few states, made their presence felt during this period, among them the Anti-Masons, Nullifiers, Barnburners, Hunkers, Loco-focos, Cotton Whigs, Conscience Whigs and the Know-Nothing (or American) party⁹⁹. By far the most successful of these, however, were the Liberty party and its successor, the Free Soil party⁹⁹, out of which grew the Republican party—the only case in our history of a third party which became one of the two major contenders for power. With the rise of the slavery issue party lines were badly broken. The Whigs were moribund in 1852 and virtually dead in 1856. Four years later the Democratic party split hopelessly over the same issue.

(III) From 1860 to the present time the two great political rivals have been the Republican⁹⁰ and Democratic parties. To secure support of the War Democrats the former rebaptized itself as the National Union party during the campaign of 1864. Issues were chiefly those of war and Reconstruction⁹¹ from 1860 to 1876; subsequently they have been predominantly economic in character except during and immediately after the World War. Also, since 1860 third parties have been numerous. Prohibitionists⁹² made their first presidential nomination in 1872. Greenbackers⁹³, dating from the late 1860's, gave expression to agrarian discontent and were succeeded by the People's (or Populist⁹⁴) party which grew rapidly from 1890 onward and is often said to have captured the Democratic convention of 1896. The present Farmer-Labor party⁹⁵ in the Northwest continues the same tradition. Similarly labor unrest has found expression through the Union Labor, Socialist Labor, Social Democratic, Socialist⁹⁶ and Communist parties⁹⁷. Twice during this period the Republicans suffered heavy defections: in 1912 when Theodore Roosevelt bolted and formed the Progressive party⁹⁸, and again in 1924 when Robert M. LaFollette⁹⁹ led an agrarian revolt of Independent Progressives.

All things considered, the two-party tradition has shown remarkable vitality in the United States. Surveying the whole of our national history, the major contending organizations have divided successes equally between themselves. Thus, nineteen presidential campaigns were won by the Federalist, Whig and Republican parties, and exactly the same number by the Jeffersonian, Jacksonian and post-Civil War Democratic party.

[C. A. Beard, *The American Party Battle*; E. R. Robinson, *The Evolution of Political Parties*; M. Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*; H. J. Ford, *Rise and Growth of American Parties*; James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*; K. H. Porter, *National Party Platforms*.]

ROBERT C. BROOKS

Political Parties, Organization of. The organization of the two major parties (Republican and Democrat¹⁰⁰) in the United States is similar, each party having a National Committee, state committees, county committees and city committees in the larger cities. Below the city committees are ward committees, and at the bottom of the organization are the precinct leaders. Also, each of the major parties has a Senatorial Committee primarily concerned with the election of party members to the United States Senate, and a Congressional Committee which functions to promote the election of party members to the lower House.

State, county and city organizations were in existence long before the parties were organized on a national scale, although the national committees of the two major parties have had a long existence. The Democratic National Committee was established in 1848 by the Democratic Convention in Baltimore which appointed one member from each state to take charge of the campaign. The Republican National Committee was formally established by a resolution of the party at its convention in 1856 providing for the selection of one member from each state and territory to serve on the National Committee during the ensuing four years. The Republican Congressional Committee was organized and has had continuous existence since it was established in 1866, being an outgrowth of the conflict between President Johnson and the Republican members of Congress (*see* Radical Republicans). The Democratic Congressional Committee was established a few years thereafter. The senatorial campaign committees of both major parties were established in 1916 following the adoption of the amendment to the Constitution providing for the direct election of United States senators (*see* Seventeenth Amendment).

Party organization in the United States has developed into a hierarchy of committees. But due to the manner in which the committees are selected in the major parties, there is no direct line of authority extending from the top of the organization to the bottom. The members of the national committees of the two major parties, 106 members on the Republican and 108 on the Democratic, are chosen by various methods, by delegates from the states to the national conventions, by state conventions, by direct primary election, or chosen by state committees. The senatorial committees, composed in the Republican party of seven members, of six members in the Democratic party, are appointed in each party by the chairman of the party caucus. The congressional committee of each party is made up of one member from each state party delegation in the House of Representatives and is elected by the delegation. State committees vary in size from eleven members in Iowa to 574 in California, and are chosen principally by two methods, direct election and by conventions. County committees are usually composed of representatives from each precinct within the county and are required in most states to be elected by the voters, in some states by conventions, while in others the choice is left to the party rules.

Since there is no direct line of authority running from top to bottom in the party organization, the whole machine is made to function by

securing co-operation among the various units. The chief methods used for securing co-operation are through overlapping membership on committees, by various forms of patronage—public positions, granting public business, privileges and immunities—by securing legislative enactments and by funds supplied by one committee to another.

[Jesse Macy, *Party Organization and Machinery*; Edward B. Logan, ed., *American Political Scene*.]

EDWARD B. LOGAN

Political Scandals. Because of its great wealth, rapid industrial expansion, large scale urbanization, and to some extent because of the mixed character of its people and the type of its government, the United States has been unusually susceptible to corruption resulting in political scandals.

While comparatively little is known of political scandals during colonial days, corrupt practices legislation indicates their existence. As early as 1790 land grants with political implications caused something of a sensation. In the middle of the 19th century large grants of public lands and credit to railroads, and unsound railroad financing, developed into scandals such as *Crédit Mobilier*⁹⁹. Again in the opening years of the 20th century land and timber frauds in the Northwest assumed large proportions which finally caused investigations implicating numerous politicians, including a United States senator. During the Harding administration the leasing of government oil lands in the Teapot Dome and Elk Hills⁹⁹ reserves was shot through with political corruption and resulted in the sentencing to prison of a former Secretary of the Interior and the resignation under fire of a Secretary of the Navy.

As early as the Jackson administration political scandals developed in the National Government in connection with appointments to public offices and the disposal of other patronage (see Spoils System). Again during the Grant administration patronage⁹⁹ and the granting of contracts came into the limelight (see Belknap Scandal). Public opinion demanded legislation decreasing the possibility of this variety of scandal after a disappointed seeker for public office had shot President Garfield in 1881 (see Pendleton Act).

In the state field public officials have sometimes contrived their elections by improper methods and again have corruptly used their public positions. For example, William Lorimer⁹⁹ of Illinois got himself elected to the United States Senate in 1908 through questionable methods.

A decade or more later political scandals developed out of attempts of T. H. Newberry⁹⁹ of Michigan, Frank L. Smith of Illinois, and W. S. Vare⁹⁹ of Pennsylvania to get themselves elected to the Senate.

Perhaps in no other field have political scandals been as numerous as in city government, although the county, which has been aptly designated the "jungle" of American politics, might surpass even the city if as much publicity had been directed at that political unit. Following the Civil War great excitement was caused in New York City and Philadelphia when the corrupt deeds of the Tweed Ring and the Gas Ring⁹⁹ came to light. In New York City the police department, the dock department and other city offices were shown to be shot through with graft by three investigations conducted by the New York Legislature during the 1890's (see Lexow Committee, The).

As the 19th century gave way to the 20th, the Muckrakers⁹⁹ publicized an era when sensational political scandals involving cities became almost commonplace. They revealed that the grafters in St. Louis had disposed of valuable franchises for their own benefit, that in Minneapolis the politicians had literally turned the city over to gamblers and confidence men, and that in San Francisco boodlers had corruptly given away valuable public property.

In the 1920's the police of Chicago were found to be leagued with gangsters, racketeers and organized vice. The Dewey grand juries in New York City during the following decade uncovered intimate relations between the underworld and prominent politicians. Election frauds have contributed to many political scandals in American cities. As late as 1937-38 Federal investigation in Kansas City led to the indictment of 275 persons, the conviction of 65 persons, and pleas of guilty from 35 individuals. In 1939 Boss Pendergast of Kansas City was sentenced to Federal prison and a political scandal of sensational proportions came to light.

[C. R. Fish, *Civil Service and Patronage*; F. R. Kent, *Great Game of Politics*; E. Spencer, *Henry Ford v. Truman H. Newberry*; Lincoln Steffens, *Autobiography*; M. R. Werner, *Tammany Hall*; C. H. Woody, *Case of Frank L. Smith*; H. Zink, *City Bosses in the United States*.]

HAROLD ZINK

Political Subdivisions. In a sense the states are political subdivisions of the United States, but their constitutional place in the Federal system clearly differentiates them from the local subdivisions within their borders. The latter derive their existence and authority from the state

and may be altered or abolished by it. Local governments are in many respects the agents of the state engaged in the administrative tasks of enforcing the laws enacted by the state and providing the services authorized by it.

Local political subdivisions may be divided into four classes: (1) general divisions of the state for state administrative purposes; (2) specially organized municipal corporations for general local purposes; (3) subdivisions of the county in rural areas for rural local services; and (4) special or *ad hoc* districts created for specialized purposes. Those in the first class are known as counties in every state but Louisiana where they are known as parishes. The second class of units includes cities, villages, incorporated towns and boroughs. The third class consists of towns and townships. The fourth class includes school districts, water control districts, irrigation districts, road and bridge districts, urban improvement districts, drainage districts, utility districts, conservation districts and many others, each usually with independent taxing and bonding power.

There are 2989 counties in 47 states, and 64 parishes in Louisiana, making a total of 3053 units performing county functions. There are 16,366 cities, villages, boroughs and incorporated towns. Unincorporated towns and townships add 20,262 more local units, lying entirely in 21 Northeastern states. Among the *ad hoc* districts, schools account for 127,108 units, water control for 2724, irrigation and conservation for 627, roads and bridges for 3802, urban improvements for 285, urban utilities for 460, and miscellaneous areas, including port districts, health districts, sanitary districts and others, account for 682 more, making a total of 175,369 units of local government in the United States in 1934. There is a definite trend toward the reduction of this number, particularly among school districts and townships, the former by consolidation, the latter by abolition.

The pattern of local government in the United States was established in colonial times. In New England the principal unit was the town where the voting inhabitants met at intervals and determined public policies (*see* Town Government in New England). These units remain today as the sole examples of the pure democracy once common in rural America. The tradition is so strong that when populations increase to the point that makes pure democracy impossible, the name of town meeting is preserved to describe a representative body in such metropolitan towns as Brookline, Mass.

In the South the county became the principal unit of local government. The large plantations²⁷

and the small number of free citizens entitled to a voice in governmental affairs led to the creation of larger areas than in the North and to the early adoption of the principle of representation in the determination of public policies. In the Middle states both counties and towns were found, the former exercising certain local functions, the latter assuming the rest.

As the tide of migration spread westward, these early forms of local government were carried with the settlers to be planted with their seed in the fertile soil of the new land. The land survey policy of the National Government furthered this trend. Public lands²⁸ in the Western states were laid off by government surveyors into townships including 36 square miles. These were convenient areas for local governmental purposes, and in many states in which these surveys were carried out the congressional townships were made into civil townships by state legislative action. Township units, however, were never erected south of Pennsylvania and the Ohio River or in Arkansas, Louisiana, or Texas, or west of the 104th meridian of longitude except for a few isolated examples in the State of Washington. County organization, on the other hand, is predominant in the South, being the sole unit of rural local government. It exists also in the Middle and Northern states, sharing the work of rural government with the township. In New England it is merely an electoral area or a judicial district. The few counties of Rhode Island are not units of government at all. In the Far West, except in parts of Washington, the county occupies much the same position as in the South.

With the development of improved roads and the acquisition of efficient transportation units even by those in the lower income groups, the rationalization of local government has become a burning problem. Modern life demands many services from government which thousands of existing local units are unable to supply. Waste accompanies overlapping and duplication of services. City-county consolidation, the integration of metropolitan communities and the consolidation of counties all are strongly urged as solutions.

[William Anderson, *The Units of Government in the United States*; Lane W. Lancaster, *Government in Rural America*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Political Theories in the United States have arisen incidental to political controversies; there is no distinctively American political theory. American thinkers have occasionally attempted to formulate more or less complete theories of the state, and American statesmen have not dis-

dained the guidance of theory in the development of public policy. But there exists no "system of principles touching the nature, functions and the end of the state which is distinguished from all others by revealing in its elements the dominating influence of American characteristics and institutions."

The aid of political theory was most frequently sought in the beginning of our institutional development. The Mayflower Compact was cast in the mould of the church covenants and brought to New England the compact theory of government⁹⁹. The Pilgrims did not regard their compact as the basis of a popular government within which they should exercise sovereign powers, but they believed it to be "as firm as any patent, and in some respects more sure." Trading company⁹⁹ charters as well as church covenants served to familiarize the early settlers with the contract philosophy. But in the hands of the New England theocrats⁹⁹ there was no means of interpreting the contract, except by reference to the duty of man to God. While popular rights were deemed to exist only by the allowance of God, there was no possibility of utilizing the contract to secure popular control. In theory all questions of doubt had to be resolved by divine law; in practice they had to be settled by the clergy.

The ideas of John Locke⁹⁹ proved a great solvent for colonial doubts in politics and religion. The interpretation of the contract was to be undertaken by reference to natural law. Clergymen pondered the rights which men had supposedly enjoyed in a state of nature and saw in them limitations upon the power of government. The turning point in colonial political thought was reached in the writings of John Wise, whose *Vindication of the Government of New England Churches* appeared in 1717. In the thought of Wise, natural law is not a real entity; it is a derivative from God. Wise is not, therefore, an exact forerunner of the revolutionary leaders who, when they came to argue from natural rights⁹⁹, sought a complete severance of divine and natural laws. It was to Locke and not to Wise that men like Samuel Adams turned for help. Nevertheless Wise's treatise put in virile language ideas of democracy and equality which were soon to become widespread in the colonies. James Otis, in his argument of February, 1761, against the writs of assistance⁹⁹, crystallized into constitutional doctrine the political thought of the colonists. Otis argued that it was a matter of indifference whether the writs were authorized by act of Parliament, since such an act would be against both the constitution and natural equity and therefore void. Political thought in America

was beginning to find a broad foundation of its own. Clergymen joined with the lawyers in an effort to justify the law of nature as a legal restraint upon authority. In their demonstration, they claimed the law of nature to have been engrafted into the British constitution⁹⁹. But this position afforded no remedy against an oppressive Parliament. Colonial statesmen therefore challenged the unity of the empire. By resorting to the contract theory they sought a more radical construction of imperial organization; they defined the British Empire in terms of a commonwealth of nations. In the *Novanglus* papers John Adams asserted that the king was the chief tie which bound the empire together. In accordance with the charters received from him and of other express or implied grants, a contractual relationship was established between the king and his colonial subjects. Allegiance was therefore owing to the king, although not to Parliament. The Declaration of Independence⁹⁹ marked the close of the controversy; the colonists had decided to resort to "the extreme medicine of the constitution." As they exercised the right of revolution⁹⁹ according to the teachings of John Locke, they continued to think in terms of the social contract philosophy of the new governments which must replace those which were destroyed. Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed and exercise them in the nature of a trust for the public good (*see Compact Theory*). This idea developed by Thomas Jefferson provides perhaps the most lucid statement ever written of the theory of popular sovereignty⁹⁹.

The ideal of a balanced government, involving the doctrine of the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances⁹⁹, which is inherent in American constitutions, is commonly supposed to have been derived from the French philosopher Montesquieu. Although the writings of Montesquieu were widely read and accepted in America as political gospel, the principles they set forth were already known to the colonists. The doctrine of the separation and balance of powers was proclaimed in Massachusetts six years before the publication of the *Esprit des Lois* in the controversy between the governor and the assembly over the demand of the former for a permanent salary. Although lacking in scientific precision, the political dynamics of colonial Massachusetts aimed to balance prerogative and popular rights. The formation of the revolutionary state constitutions, except in Pennsylvania, was undertaken upon a basis of the separation and balance of powers. Despite the clarity with which the theory was set forth, the constitutions

everywhere showed a tendency for the legislature to engross the powers of the other departments. It was to remedy the defects of the state constitutions quite as much as to form a more perfect union that the Convention of 1787th was called

The form of government set up in the Constitutionth was denominated republican. "As long as the offices are open to all men," said Hamilton, "and no constitutional rank is established, it is pure republicanism." While the genius of the American people was in favor of democracy, it was recognized there must be sufficient stability in government to secure the protection of private rights. The evils of democracy were to be cured by constitutional contrivances which would establish a nice poise and balance of political forces, and the government was to derive its authority from the people through the principles of representation. "What is the principle of representation?" Said William Paterson at Philadelphia: "It is an expedient by which an assembly of certain individuals chosen by the people is substituted in place of the inconvenient meeting of the people themselves." This theory emphasizes the notion that representation is designed to secure in the government a reflex of the entire electorate rather than to generate an organ of control over the government. The Constitution was, from the point of view of 18th century political theory, a democratic document. But its democratic character depends largely upon the failure to lodge political power in the hands of special classes or interests. The growth of social and economic equality could not be endangered as long as the suffrageth was unrestricted, the apportionment of representationth was according to the rule of numbers, and new states could be admitted on a parity with those already established.

The twin pillars of democracy are the principles of universal suffrage and majority ruleth. Neither of these existed in the United States in 1787, but frontier individualism soon proved a powerful factor in democratizing political institutions. The issue between the frontier and the older settlements was fought out in the Virginia constitutional convention of 1829-30. In reply to the arguments of the seaboard property owners in behalf of existing political arrangements, the men of the interior insisted that the reform of the franchise and of representation was the logical culmination of the earlier revolutionary movement. The political equality asserted in 1776 was inconsistent with the unequal apportionment of representation and the maintenance of property qualifications for the suffrage. For a time the movement toward universal suffrage

paused briefly to rest the franchise upon a tax-paying qualification. This was but a half-way station on the route to the ultimate abandonment of all restrictions upon the franchise. The adoption of universal manhood suffrage throughout the United States assured the triumph of the principle of majority rule. While the slavery controversy convulsed the South, the ideas of John C. Calhounth were put forward in behalf of government by a concurrent majority. According to this view, the sense of each section or interest must be taken through its majority or appropriate organ, and the united sense of all as the sense of the entire community. Calhoun's attempt to define democracy in terms of minority rule did not prevail, although the latent possibilities of tyranny in the unrestricted rule of the majority cannot be argued away. The realization of democracy in the United States was an achievement of the 19th century. It was fully defined in the words of Lincoln at Gettysburg—"government of the people, by the people, and for the people." But this impressive formula does no more than reflect the liberal spirit of the Convention of 1787. With the settlement of the interior valleys of the West and the admission of new states into the Union, aristocratic pretensions came to be disregarded. The sort of equality contemplated by the Declaration of Independence gradually permeated the whole political system.

The American people had by 1787 come into possession of almost the whole of their stock of political ideas. Borrowing largely from English liberal thought of the 17th century, American philosophers, clergymen and statesmen joined their efforts to adapt the ideas to the circumstances of a new country. Viewed in proper perspective, the period from 1787 to the outbreak of the Civil War is one in which the liberal thought of the Federal Convention attained its full fruition. It was only by stages that democracy was achieved in the United States. The victory of the armed forces of the United States in 1865 settled many controversies, but it marks the end of systematic development in American political thought. The Civil War was followed by a long period of stagnation in political thought in the United States. Occasionally the calm was disturbed by radical labor movements and by agrarian discontent, but these left untouched the fundamental concepts upon which the American political system had been made to rest. In our own day, however, the widespread economic depression which followed the stock market crash of 1929 has led to a re-examination of our political philosophy. Already a greater measure of col-

lectivism has displaced the old individualism as a principle of political action

[W. S. Carpenter, *The Development of American Political Thought*.]

WILLIAM S. CARPENTER

Political Writings in America began with the polemical pamphlets of the New England divines who in 1647-48 were alleged to have written in support of Independency as an ecclesiastical system in the colonies. *The Survey of the Summe of Church Discipline* by Thomas Hooker, *The Way of the Congregational Churches Cleared* by John Cotton, and *The Power of the Congregational Churches Asserted and Vindicated* by John Davenport were supposed to have been written to aid the Puritan movement in England and to combat Presbyterianism. The dull theological controversies of the 17th century were unrelieved until John Wise in 1717 published his *Vindication of New England Churches*. Borrowing heavily from the natural law philosophy, Wise offered a powerful solvent for doubts in politics as well as theology, and paved the way for the sermons of clergymen who were to influence the revolutionary patriots and statesmen.

The Revolution in 1776 led to the reprinting in America of many liberal works of earlier days and released a flood of new pamphlets. The publication of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*⁹⁹ in January, 1776, is said to have influenced greatly the movement for independence. The construction of state constitutions⁹⁹ was aided by the publication in the same year of John Adams' *Thoughts on Government* and a pamphlet entitled *The People the Best Governors*, by an unknown writer. The Constitution of the United States would probably have failed of ratification if it had not been supported by Madison, Hamilton and Jay in the papers known as the *Federalist*⁹⁹.

Jeffersonian democracy found its philosopher and its advocate in John Taylor "of Caroline." His *Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States* (1814), *Construction Construed and Constitutions Vindicated* (1820), *Tyranny Unmasked* (1822), and *New Views of the Constitution of the United States* (1823) were in answer to John Adams' *Defence of the Constitutions of the United States* (1787-88) and the *Federalist*. The ideas of Andrew Jackson found a warm exponent in Thomas Hart Benton, whose *Thirty Years' View* appeared in 1854. By that time the slavery controversy had brought forth many books and pamphlets, the most important of which were John C. Calhoun's *Disquisition on Government*⁹⁹ and a *Discourse on the Constitution and Gov-*

ernment of the United States. These two works reach a very high level in the literature of political thought and supply the foundations for *A Constitutional View of the Late War between the States* by Alexander Stephens in 1868 and *The Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government* by Jefferson Davis in 1881. Other books dealt more directly with the issue of slavery. Among these were the *Speeches of William Lloyd Garrison* (1852) and William Hosmer's *The Higher Law in Its Relation to Civil Government* (1832) in which the abolition of slavery was advocated, while Gov. Hammond of South Carolina in *Slavery in the Light of Political Science* (1845) and George Fitzhugh in *Slavery Justified* (1850), *Sociology for the South* (1854) and *Cannibals All!* (1857) defended the slaveowners. The most eventful book in the slavery controversy was H. R. Helper's *The Impending Crisis*⁹⁹ (1859), in which a Southerner declared that slavery must disappear before the people could prosper.

Foreign influences in American political writing began with the publication in 1838-39 of Francis Lieber's *Manual of Political Ethics*. Following the Civil War, German transcendentalism influenced Elisha Mulford's *The Nation* (1870) and, to a lesser extent, J. C. Hurd's *The Theory of Our National Existence* (1881). The German influence, which began with Lieber, became exhausted in the writings of John W. Burgess, whose *Political Science and Comparative Constitutional Law* appeared in 1891. These academic treatises were followed by a few books which were widely read. Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*⁹⁹ (1879) advocated the "single tax" on land, and Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888) drew an appealing picture of the advantages of a co-operative society. But European ideas, although not disdained in the United States, found small acceptance. The truth is that new currents of thought were stirring in this country at the turn of the century which found congenial expression in political literature.

The beginning of the 20th century saw the appearance of Herbert Croly's *The Promise of American Life* (1900), and lines began to be drawn in the battle to improve the American political system. Bryce's *American Commonwealth* (1888) had already created an awareness of the problems which confronted the United States. While Ida M. Tarbell in the *History of the Standard Oil Company* (1902) exposed the iniquities of big business, Lincoln Steffens in *The Shame of the Cities* (1900) started a movement for the improvement of local government. The *Autobiography* of Robert M. LaFollette in 1913 and *The Wisconsin Idea* of Charles Mc-

Carthy in 1912 pointed the way to constructive measures to strengthen American democracy. Woodrow Wilson, after writing *Congressional Government* (1885) and *Constitutional Government in the United States* (1908) as a professor of political science, confessed his political faith in the *New Freedom* (1913) and became President. At the time of our entry into the World War, political writing in the United States was bent upon the rededication of the government to the principles of democracy.

The stagnation which ensued upon the return of peace remained almost unbroken until 1933. James Truslow Adams' *Epic of America* (1932), the political biographies by Allan Nevins and Tyler Dennett, and the critical appraisals of contemporary public affairs by Walter Lippmann and Charles A. Beard prevented the total eclipse of ideals by the materialistic environment. But it was not until the collapse of the economic system in the 1930's that the people of the United States began once more to examine the foundations of their government.

WILLIAM S. CARPENTER

Polk Doctrine. President James K. Polk's first annual message, Dec. 2, 1845, reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine¹ and at the same time extended the scope and narrowed the boundaries of the Monroe-Adams dictum by announcing American determination "that no future European colony or dominion shall, with our consent, be planted or established on any part of the North American continent," and American intention to resist "any European interference . . ." there. He thus added to the original idea of noncolonization of unoccupied territory that of "dominion," which has been defined as including acquisition "by voluntary transfer or by conquest of territory already occupied"; and emphasized opposition to "any interference." He also restricted the geographical radius of his prohibition to North America. This doctrine, applied in 1848 to discourage Yucatan from voluntarily ceding itself to some European power, was looked upon by Latin-American nations as a limitation upon their sovereignty.

[S. F. Bemis, ed., *The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy*, Vol. V.]

L. ETHAN ELLIS

Poll Tax. A tax levied upon the person of a taxpayer rather than upon his property is called a poll or capitation (head) tax. Since it is an equal contribution from each person, it has no relation to ability to pay and falls most heavily upon those least able to meet it.

A poll tax was employed in all of the Ameri-

can colonies at one period or another. It was the only direct tax levied in Virginia for years. Maryland had practically no other direct tax before the Revolution. A survey made in 1923 showed that thirty-eight states had laws permitting or requiring the collection of poll taxes for one purpose or another. California, Ohio and Maryland forbid the imposition of such taxes by provisions in their state constitutions.

In those states which use the poll tax the amount varies from one dollar to five dollars per year. Minnesota levies the tax in labor with a maximum of four days per year. Many other states permit the commutation of the tax by labor, usually upon rural roads. The principal beneficiaries of poll taxes are schools and roads. The taxpayers are electors or able-bodied males, depending upon the purpose. Payment of the tax is a prerequisite to the exercise of the suffrage in ten Southern states.

[Harvey Walker, *The Poll Tax in the United States*, in *National Tax Assn. Bulletin*, November-December, 1923.]

HARVEY WALKER

Polling Places have been provided in the United States since early colonial days, but the adoption of universal adult suffrage added greatly to their importance. A polling place is usually established in every election precinct or for every 200-800 voters. Located either in public structures, such as schoolhouses, or in private buildings, polling places house voting booths, ballot boxes or voting machines, registration records and election supplies, and other equipment for the three or more election officials in charge. They usually remain open for voting from six or seven A.M. until four P.M. or later. After voting ceases, ballots² are ordinarily counted and returns made there.

[J. P. Harris, *Election Administration in the United States*; E. M. Sait, *American Parties and Elections*.]

HAROLD ZINK

Pollock v. Farmers Loan and Trust Co. (1895). The Supreme Court ruled in this case that the income tax provision of the Gorman-Wilson tariff³ was unconstitutional on the ground that it was a direct tax and hence subject to the requirement of apportionment among the states according to population. In a prior hearing, only the tax on real-estate income had been declared unconstitutional and the Court had divided evenly, four to four, regarding other forms of income. On a rehearing, the Court decided five to four against the income tax on personal property, due to the fact that one Justice, evidently Brewer, now reversed himself to oppose the income tax and another, Jackson, who had not

participated in the earlier hearing, voted with the minority. This decision inspired a popular attack on "judicial usurpation" resulting in the Democratic income tax plank of 1896, and leading ultimately to the passage of the Sixteenth Amendment⁷⁰.

[Charles Warren, *The Supreme Court in U. S. History.*]

HARVEY WISH

Pollock's Aid to the Revolution. With the opening of hostilities, the supply of gunpowder and arms heretofore purchased by the colonists in England and the West Indies was cut off. An agent sent by the governor of Virginia to New Orleans (1776) procured 10,000 pounds of powder through the mediation of Oliver Pollock with Unzaga, the Spanish governor. This was shipped to the upper Ohio River posts and to Philadelphia (see Gibson-Linn Episode; Spanish Military Supplies from New Orleans).

George Rogers Clark, after the capture of Kaskaskia (July 4, 1778), turned to Pollock for assistance as he had been directed to do by Gov. Patrick Henry. Arms, powder, blankets, sugar, coffee and other supplies forwarded by Pollock enabled Clark, as he stated, "to gain and hold possession of the Illinois country." Serving also as commercial agent for the Continental Congress⁷¹, Pollock continued to forward similar cargoes of goods procured, from Spanish creditors, for the use of the American army in the East.

By July, 1779, his credit was exhausted and he was forced to mortgage his landholdings and dispose of his slaves. Neither the United States nor Virginia was able to meet his calls for financial assistance. By the close of the war, he had advanced for the American cause his entire property amounting to \$100,000 and an additional \$200,000 which he had borrowed. This amount surpasses the contribution of any other person to the direct cause of the Revolution.

[James Alton James, *Oliver Pollock, Life and Times of an Unknown Patriot.*]

JAMES A. JAMES

Polls, Popular. See Sampling Referenda.

Polly Admiralty Case. By the Rule of the War of 1756⁷² Great Britain had contended that colonial trade of an enemy, which in time of peace had not been open to outside powers, could not in time of war be open to neutral carriage. During the wars of the French Revolution the British government accordingly confiscated neutral vessels carrying goods between France or her allies and their colonies. Partly as a means of diverting enemy colonial commerce through British ports, and partly as a means of ingratiating the neutral

United States, then on the verge of hostilities with France, British Orders in Council of Jan. 25, 1798, allowed neutral vessels to carry the produce of any island or settlement of France, Holland or Spain direct to a British port or to a port of their own country. This permitted the development of an American "entrepôt" traffic of West India goods to European ports after Americanization in the United States. In the case of the *Polly* (II C. Robinson, 361), tried by British Admiralty Courts in 1802 (during the interim of peace), it was decided that this circuitous voyage (via the United States and Americanization of French colonial goods) to French enemy ports, was not a violation of the Rule of the War of 1756. (See also *Essex*, The)

[A. T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812.*]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Polygamy is usually polygyny (i.e., plural wives), rarely polyandry (plural husbands). Polygyny, whether legal or surreptitious, is more common among prosperous classes, polyandry among the underprivileged, where it merges with prostitution⁷³. In general, legally valid polygamy is absent from Christian countries. However, polygamous living has been a custom practised by certain sects and minorities, the most important of these in the United States being the Mormons and the Oneida Perfectionists⁷⁴. In the ante-bellum South, slaves were encouraged or permitted to mate according to the wishes of their owners, sometimes polygamously.

What is essentially polygamous living is practised by many individuals secretly, or with the knowledge of limited circles of acquaintances who approve or tolerate the situation. It is to be distinguished from prostitution in that it involves continuity of relationship, with affection and responsibility toward the extra mate. Such relationships, indicated by the term "concubine," "mistress," "lover," etc., have been described as occurring in many places in the American colonies and throughout American history. Toleration has varied from time to time and from place to place. Apparently there is more toleration in recent years and in large cities than in small communities or in the "Victorian" period. Adultery is a crime in many states, but is seldom prosecuted criminally. More often it forms the ground for a civil suit for divorce⁷⁵ by the innocent party. Occasionally a person, concealing the facts or ignorant of the law, goes through the form of a marriage ceremony with his second or illicit partner; this constitutes bigamy, which is a crime, and furthermore the marriage thus attempted is legally null and void. Many divorces,

if contested in the courts of the home state, would be found invalid, and hence the remarriage of the parties would be bigamous. However, in such case a civil suit for property is much more likely, in practice, than a criminal prosecution for bigamy. Some writers have said that our high divorce rate results in a form of "serial polygamy," as distinguished from "simultaneous polygamy."

[A. W. Calhoun, *A Social History of the American Family*; E. R. Groves, *The American Family*.]

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM

Pomeroy Circular, THE, a Chase-for-President pronouncement, was issued in January, 1864, by a National Executive Committee of Radical Republicans^{es} over the signature of its chairman, Sen. S. C. Pomeroy. Distributed secretly at first, it was publicized through the *National Intelligencer*^{es}, Feb. 22. Unconditional Union men, believing Lincoln's re-election undesirable and impossible, found that Salmon P. Chase combined those qualities necessary for a more vigorous prosecution of the war. In explaining the Circular to the Senate in March, Pomeroy asserted that the Committee, without consulting Chase, had drafted him as their candidate. Meanwhile, the Chase boom had collapsed with the declaration of Ohio Unionists for Lincoln.

[John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln: A History*, VIII.]

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

Ponce de Leon's Discovery (1513) added the mainland of North America to the Spanish dominions. In 1512 Juan Ponce de Leon secured a royal grant, with the title of *adelantado*, to conquer the island of Bimini to the northward of Cuba where the Fountain of Youth presumably was located. Sailing from Puerto Rico, March 3, 1513, he sighted the mainland on the 27th and on April 2 landed near the mouth of St. Johns River. In honor of the Easter season the region was named Florida. Re-embarking, Ponce de Leon explored the eastern shore of Florida, doubled the Cape, and passed along the Florida Keys which he called The Martyrs. He continued along the western coast, probably reaching Pensacola Bay, and returned to Puerto Rico on Sept. 21. Besides taking possession of Florida, he discovered the Bahama Channel. Returning to Spain in 1514, he received a grant to colonize the islands of Florida and Bimini, but it was not until 1521 that he undertook the second expedition from Puerto Rico to Florida. Reaching the peninsula, he began a settlement, probably on Charlotte Bay. The Indians were hostile, and in a battle the *adelantado* was severely wounded. Thereupon, the effort at colo-

nization was abandoned, and the expedition returned to Havana where Ponce de Leon died.

[Frederick A. Ober, *Juan Ponce de Leon*.]

ROSCOE R. HILL

Pontchartrain, Lake, named by Iberville in 1699 in honor of Louis de Phélypeaux, Count de Pontchartrain, French Minister of Marine, lies five miles north of New Orleans^{es}, with which it was connected by canal in 1795, by railroad in 1831, and by ship canal in 1921. The Bonnet Carré spillway, recently constructed to protect New Orleans against Mississippi River floods, connects lake and river above the city. Lake Pontchartrain formed a link in the British inside passage to the Mississippi, 1763-83, and in the later overland route to the north and east.

[John S. Kendall, *History of New Orleans*; Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Pontchartrain Du Detroit, Fort, was established by Cadillac, July 24, 1701. The original fort was a rectangular stockade one arpent (192.24 feet) square without the bastions; within were erected the church, the barracks, the storehouse and other structures essential to a civilized community. Around it the Detroit River settlement grew up, and eventually the city of Detroit. Frequently enlarged, and with various changes of name (Fort Lernoult, Fort Shelby, Detroit), the fortification continued to guard the settlement for a century and a quarter.

[C. M. Burton, *City of Detroit, Michigan, 1701-1922*; Burton, *Fort Pontchartrain du Detroit*, in *Mich. Pro. Colls.*, Vol. XXIX.]

M. M. QUAAFE

Pontiac War, THE (1763-64). Montreal and Canada surrendered to the English Sept. 8, 1760, and immediately Maj. Robert Rogers was sent to take over the western posts (*see* French and Indian War). Detroit was reached Nov. 29, but the advent of winter prevented the occupation of Mackinac and the posts around Lake Michigan until the following summer.

Although New France^{es} had been conquered, it remained to reckon with the western Indians, who had not been consulted in the surrender. Their dissatisfaction found expression almost at once in a plot to expel the English from the country. It was discovered, and at a great council at Detroit^{es} (September, 1761), Sir William Johnson strove to allay the native discontent. Although he succeeded temporarily, the underlying causes of dissatisfaction—resentment of the arrogance of officials and the dishonesty of the traders, fear of the advancing tide of frontier settlement, regret over the passing of their French "father"—remained.

In the spring of 1763 the gathering tempest broke, and almost simultaneously the posts from Niagara and Fort Pitt to Mackinac and St. Joseph^{ms} were attacked. Sandusky fell on May 16; St. Joseph, May 25; Miami, May 27, Ouatanon, June 1; Mackinac, June 4; Presqu' Isle, June 16; Venango about the same date, and LeBoeuf on June 18. Of all the forts scattered over a thousand miles of wilderness, only Niagara, Fort Pitt and Detroit stood fast. In most cases the attack was begun by stealth, and savage success was immediate. Following the initial attacks the frontier settlements were ravaged with fire and axe, and more persons (chiefly settlers) are said to have perished in 1763 than in 1759, when the French and Indian War was at its height.

Because of the central location and the military importance of Detroit, where Pontiac directed the attack, the struggle has become known as the Pontiac War. Here the vigilance of Maj. Gladwin defeated the attempted surprise, and his vigorous leadership maintained the defense against heavy odds during many desperate weeks. At the close of July, Capt. Dalzel arrived with 250 Redcoats and a small number of Rangers led by the redoubtable Rogers^{ms}. A night attack upon Pontiac's camp followed, resulting in the death of Dalzel and the disastrous defeat known ever since as the battle of Bloody Run^{ms}. The siege was discontinued with the approach of winter, but the garrison was not finally relieved until the arrival of Col. Bradstreet's^{ms} army in the summer of 1764.

In a great council held at Detroit in August, Bradstreet dictated terms of peace which the forest diplomats, who completely outgeneraled the white leader, accepted with no intention of observing. Meanwhile Col. Bouquet^{ms}, a keener soldier than Bradstreet, was fighting his way across Pennsylvania to Fort Pitt. From here, in October, he advanced into Ohio, where his stern measures reduced the savages to submission. Finally, in a council at Oswego^{ms} in July, 1766, Sir William Johnson confirmed and completed the treaty begun at Detroit two years earlier. The Indians acknowledged the sovereignty of King George, surrendered their white captives, and agreed to deliver to the nearest commandant individuals guilty of committing violence upon Englishmen. Pontiac was pardoned by the English, but his meteoric career practically ended with the defeat of his race in the war. In 1769 he was slain at Cahokia by an Indian who was supposed to have been bribed by a trader to commit the deed. His siege of Detroit^{ms} in 1763-64 has become classic in the annals of

Indian warfare; his failure illustrates the common inability of a savage people to wage successful warfare against a civilized nation.

[Francis Parkman, *The Conspiracy of Pontiac*, C. M. Burton, ed., *Journal of Pontiac's Conspiracy*; Alexander Henry, *Travels and Adventures in Canada and the Indian Territories*]

M. M. QUAIFFE

Pontotoc, Battle of. See Chicaca, Indian Town.

Pontotoc, Treaty of (Oct. 20, 1832), negotiated by Gen. John Coffee, United States Commissioner, with the Chickasaws^{ms} at their Council House in what is now Pontotoc County, northeast Mississippi, provided for the cession of Chickasaw lands (6,283,804 acres) in northeastern Mississippi and the removal of the tribe west of the Mississippi, thereby extinguishing the last Indian titles to lands in the state (see Indian Removal). The United States promised the Indians the proceeds from the sales of the lands.

[C. C. Royce, *Indian Land Cessions*.]

MACK SWEARINGEN

Pony Express, THE. During the late 1850's the question of the best route for the overland mail to California was a topic of great interest in the Far West. In September, 1857, a contract was granted to John Butterfield and his famous Overland Mail^{ms}, which began operation one year later over a circuitous southern route. The shortest time made on this route was twenty-two days. Many Californians, including Sen. William M. Gwin, believed that a central route was entirely feasible and would expedite the carrying of mail to the coast. It was Sen. Gwin who, early in 1860, induced William H. Russell, of the great freighting firm of Russell, Majors and Waddell^{ms}, to demonstrate the practicability of a central route in a dramatic manner by establishing a pony express. Of course, the hope of securing a lucrative mail contract was the motivating factor with the company (see Central Overland California and Pikes Peak Express).

The project was pushed vigorously. Starting at St. Joseph, Mo., the route in general followed the well-known Oregon-California trail^{ms}, by way of Fort Kearny, old Julesburg, Scotts Bluff, Fort Laramie, South Pass, Fort Bridger and Salt Lake City. From the latter point, however, the trail went around the southern end of the Great Salt Lake, by way of Fort Churchill, Carson City and Placerville to Sacramento. Stations were built at intervals of about fifteen miles, where stage stations did not already exist. Fleet, wiry, Indian ponies were purchased; and young, courageous, lightweight riders were hired. On April 3, 1860,

the service was inaugurated. It was like a giant relay, in which about seventy-five ponies participated in each direction. At each station the riders were given two minutes in which to transfer the saddlebags to fresh ponies and be on their way again. After riding a certain distance, one rider would hand the mail over to another, and so on, until the destination was reached Day and night, summer and winter, over dusty plains and dangerous mountain trails, and frequently in the midst of hostile Indians, the ponies and their riders galloped at their best speed over the sections of the route allotted to them.

During the eighteen months of the operation of the pony express only one trip was missed. The service was weekly at first and later semi-weekly. The best time ever made was in November, 1860, when news of Lincoln's election was carried in six days from Fort Kearny⁹⁰, Nebr., to Fort Churchill, Nev., then the termini of the telegraph⁹¹ lines which were being built from the Missouri River and California. When the two telegraph lines were joined in October, 1861, all need for the pony express was eliminated.

The pony express was disastrous to the fortunes of Russell, Majors and Waddell. The cost of operation was greatly in excess of the revenue. In fact the company was virtually ruined by the experiment, and was disappointed in its hope of gaining a valuable mail contract, which went to another firm. Furthermore, the enterprise was not even necessary, as things turned out, as a demonstration of the feasibility of a central route. The outbreak of the Civil War made the selection of such a route inevitable. Nevertheless, the pony express is one of the episodes in the history of the Far West which still fires the imagination and is depicted in frontier pageantry.

[Glenn D. Bradley, *The Story of the Pony Express*; Le Roy Hafen, *The Overland Mail, 1849-1869*; William and George H. Banning, *Six Horses*.]

DAN E. CLARK

Pools, Railroad. Agreements among railroads to divide competitive business are called pools. The equalization may be made either by dividing traffic or by dividing income. Since traffic pools limited the right of the shipper to route his own business, money pools were more common. The cattle eveners' pool, formed in 1875, to equalize traffic in livestock between Chicago and New York was an example of the traffic type. The Chicago-Omaha pool, dividing business among three railroads dated from 1870. Pooling agreements were common in the period from 1870 to 1887, but they were outlawed by Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act of

1887. They were succeeded by rate agreements, at least one of which, the Buffalo Grain Pool, was practically a pooling agreement. Even the rate agreements were held to be a violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act in the *United States v. Trans-Missouri Freight Association*⁹². In the Transportation Act of 1920⁹³, however, pooling agreements were legalized when approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission⁹⁴. But the railroads have not seen fit to make much use of this privilege. They had found other methods which seemed more suitable for their needs.

[D. P. Locklin, *Economics of Transportation*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Poor, Care of. See Pauperism and Poverty.

Poor Richard's Almanac (1732-96), within a year of its first appearance, became the most popular book, excepting the Bible⁹⁵, in the American colonies. Any almanac⁹⁶ was an important publication in 18th-century America, for it contained information necessary to every American farmer. In view of the fact that seven were published in Philadelphia in 1732, it would have seemed unlikely that another would be successful. However, Benjamin Franklin had new ideas which he felt would insure the success of his venture. Along with the usual information on the weather, tides, eclipses and medicinal remedies, Franklin printed the maxims, saws and pithy sayings which were even then making him famous. Each edition saw an increase in sales until 10,000 copies were printed annually, approximately one for every hundred people in the colonies.

It is probable that Franklin ceased to write for the almanac after 1748, when he began to devote most of his time and energy to public affairs. In 1757 he disposed of the almanac which, however, continued to appear until 1796. In 1758 Franklin collected the best of his writings from *Poor Richard's Almanac* in *Father Abraham's Speech* more commonly known as *The Way to Wealth*. In this form, the sayings of Poor Richard have become a permanent part of our literature.

[John Bach McMaster, *Benjamin Franklin as a Man of Letters*.]

E. H. O'NEILL

Poor Whites as a term was applied in the antebellum South to those nonslaveholders who fell in the social class below yeomen farmers, artisans and sturdy frontiersmen. As originally developed the term carried a stigma beyond poverty and was applied only to a small group, usually

squatters on the poorest lands. Economically there seemed no function for a manual-labor class in an agrarian society in which yeomen did their own work and slaves served the upper classes. The existence of this group came to be aggravated by poverty, whiskey, hookworm, malaria and inadequate diet; and attempts were made to trace them back to a permanent class descended from transported felons and indentured servants⁷⁹. Later interpretation is more kindly, accepting the poor white as a stranded frontiersman overcome by an inhospitable environment.

The extension of the term beyond this small class must be credited to ante-bellum travelers who were baffled by finding a large yeomanry outside the charmed circle of the planter aristocracy. Thus extended, the term then came to be used in antislavery polemics as the example of what slavery did to a free white population. Even when they were desperately poor, the term was never applied to the mountain people⁸⁰. The stamina and vitality displayed by the enlisted men as "foot cavalry" in the Confederate armies laid to rest theories of biological degeneracy of the common man of the South, while the freeing of the slaves opened employment in agriculture and manual labor to underprivileged groups. The problem of poor whites then became merged in the general problems of poverty, unequal distribution of income, land tenure and labor conditions.

[A. N. J. den Hollander, *The Tradition of "Poor Whites,"* Ch. XX in *Culture in the South*.]

RUPERT B. VANCE

"Pop-Gun Bills," THE, were tariff measures passed by the Democratic House after the elections of 1890. Although blocked in the Senate, they were effective in focusing attention on the defects in the McKinley Act⁸¹ and creating issues for the campaign of 1892⁸². The term arose when the Republicans contemptuously referred to the measures as "pop guns."

[Edward Stanwood, *American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century.*]

L. J. MEYER

Pope-McGill Farm Act of 1938, THE, otherwise known as the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938⁸³, was approved on Feb. 16, 1938. Title I added amendments to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936⁸⁴ which was definitely continued in operation. Title II authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to complain to the Interstate Commerce Commission⁸⁵ concerning freight rates on farm products and to set up four regional laboratories to find new uses for agricultural products. The Federal Sur-

plus Commodities Corporation is continued until June 30, 1942. Title III authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, under prescribed conditions, to proclaim national marketing quotas for tobacco, corn, wheat, cotton and rice. Title IV had to do with "Cotton Pool Participation Trust Certificates," while Title V created a Federal Crop Insurance Corporation with a capital of \$100,000,000 within the Department of Agriculture⁸⁶ to insure wheat crops against unavoidable losses.

[*Statutes at Large*, Vol. 50.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Popham Colony, THE. Though English and European fishermen had long been taking cod⁸⁷ along the coast, the first attempt by England to colonize the New England region was the ill-starred Popham plantation on the Kennebec, 1607-8.

On May 31, 1607, the Plymouth Company of Virginia⁸⁸, proprietors of northern Virginia, spurred on by hopes of profitable farming of the rich resources of fish, lumber, furs, minerals and medicinal herbs reported by the navigators, Gosnold (1602), Pring (1603) and Weymouth (1605), sent out about 120 colonists in two ships, the *Mary and John* and the *Gift of God*. George Popham, brother of Sir John Popham, Chief Justice of England and sponsor of the venture, was President, and Raleigh Gilbert was Admiral.

These men, having reached Seguin Island, landed at the mouth of the Kennebec (Sagadahoc) River⁸⁹, on the western bank, in the middle of August, 1607. They built a fort and named it St. George, after England's patron saint, a storhouse, fifty dwellings and a church. The first Protestant church service was conducted here by the colony's Anglican clergyman, Richard Seymour. The settlers began the construction of a ship, a pinnacle of thirty tons, *Virginia of Sagadahoc*, first ship built by Englishmen in North America; they explored the river up to Merrymeeting Bay, the Androscoggin branch to Pejepscot⁹⁰, Casco Bay on the coast to the west, and eastward to Pemaquid. They made friends with the Indians and traded with them. But things went wrong with the colony from the first. The reason for failure may lie in John Aubrey's statement that the colony was stocked "out of all the gaols of England." Quarrels arose, all but forty-five men had to be shipped home when the second ship left, in December. On top of that disaster, there came a savage Maine winter. President Popham died. Though ships brought supplies in the summer of 1608, news of the death of Sir John Popham, sponsor, and of Gil-

bert's brother came also. So, in September, the settlers pulled up stakes and went home. A story, never verified by documentation, persisted for years that some colonists remained and joined the semi-permanent fishing settlements to the east.

[Purchas, *Pilgrimes*, 1614; *A Briefe Relation of the Discovery and Plantation of New England*, 1622; William Strachey, *Historie of Travaile into Virginia Brittania*, ca. 1616, Hakluyt Society, 1849, H. O. Thayer, *Sagadahoc Colony*; Robert P. Tristram Coffin, *Kennebec*.]

ROBERT P. TRISTRAM COFFIN

Popular Sovereignty. In a general sense, this term means the right of the people to rule. "Squatter Sovereignty" literally means the right of people living anywhere without a government to form a body politic and practise self-government. When the theory that the people of a Federal territory had the right to determine the slavery^o question for themselves was first enunciated, it was dubbed "Squatter Sovereignty" by its opponents. The term has persisted and is often used as the equivalent of Popular Sovereignty.

When Lewis Cass, writing to A. O. P. Nicholson on Dec. 24, 1847, declared that he was "in favor of leaving the people of any territory which may hereafter be acquired, the right to regulate it [slavery] themselves, under the great general principles of the Constitution," he made the first clear statement of the principle of Popular Sovereignty. Acts organizing the territories of Utah and New Mexico were passed in 1850 (*see* Compromise of 1850). In neither territory was slavery prohibited or protected. It was simply provided that each of the territories should be admitted with or without slavery as its constitution might specify.

Sen. Stephen A. Douglas made the Kansas-Nebraska Bill^o a popular sovereignty measure which repealed the antislavery provision of the Missouri Compromise of 1820^o. That popular sovereignty would produce a bitter struggle for Kansas was as difficult to foresee as was the Civil War. The conflict which followed the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act was really decided by the forces controlling the westward movement^o of the 1850's. So superior were the drawing qualities of northern and southern frontier areas in competition with Kansas that only a small proportion of the migrating colonists reached that territory before 1860. The conditions prevailing between 1854 and 1860 were such that those interested in making Kansas a slaveholding state had no chance of success (*see* Border War). Even the modest contingent from the North, largely from Ohio, Indiana and Illi-

nois, greatly outnumbered the contribution from the entire South to Kansas. The Southerners who settled in the territory were mainly nonslaveholders from the upper South, and many of them voted with the free-state element, when, on Aug. 2, 1858, it was finally determined by a large majority that Kansas would not become a slaveholding state (*see* Lecompton Constitution). The Lincoln-Douglas debates^o came after the people of Kansas had made this decision and there was no remaining Federal territory where the conditions were so favorable to slavery.

Douglas opposed the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution on the ground that Popular Sovereignty had not been fairly applied when that constitution was first submitted to the people. Through the aid of Republicans, he won the Lecompton fight, which preceded the debates with Abraham Lincoln. The Dred Scott decision^o had come a year before the Lecompton contest. The opinion of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney troubled the leaders of the new Republican party^o, because it ran directly counter to the Wilmot Proviso^o principle. Lincoln believed that Taney had played havoc with Popular Sovereignty also, though Douglas declared that he had accepted the Court's decision. Before the beginning of the debates, the logic of the situation caused Douglas to discuss the effects of the decision on his principle of nonintervention. His Freeport Doctrine^o in response to Lincoln's famous second question was new to neither of the senatorial candidates. The assertion of Douglas that slavery could not exist in any territory where the territorial legislature refused to provide the necessary police regulations squared with the facts, and the people of a territory really could decide for themselves regardless of how the Supreme Court might in the future decide the abstract question of the right of a territorial legislature to prohibit slavery. When Sen. Albert G. Brown of Mississippi complained on the floor of the Senate on Feb. 23, 1859, that "Non-action goes a great way to exclude slave property from a Territory, further perhaps than to exclude any other property," he was virtually repeating what Douglas had asserted at Freeport. On the basis of his belief that territorial legislatures would exclude slavery by non-action, Sen. Brown voiced the demand that Congress provide the necessary legislation. It was then that Douglas added the second and final corollary to the doctrine of Popular Sovereignty, when he proclaimed that he would "never vote for a slave code in the Territories by Congress."

[*Centennial History of Illinois*, Vol. III; Chas. W. Ramsdell, *The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion*, in *Miss.*

Valley Hist. Rev., September, 1929; William O. Lynch, *The Convergence of Lincoln and Douglas*, in *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 1925, and *Population Movements in Relation to the Struggle for Kansas*, in *Studies in American History*, inscribed to James A. Woodburn.]

WILLIAM O. LYNCH

Popular Vote, Presidential. According to the Constitution the choice of the presidential electors of each state is to take place "in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct." At the beginning of our national history state legislatures frequently appointed electors directly without any reference of the matter to the electorate. This was done, for example, by nine out of fifteen states in the presidential election of 1792. With the rise of Jacksonian democracy¹, however, popular election became the rule.

Population, Growth and Movements of. The following table shows the growth of population in the United States since the beginning of European settlement. For the first few decades of

Owing to the subsequent growth of population the electorate thus called to the polls every four years has become the largest in the history of the world to fill a single office, the fate of the Vice-Presidency following that of the Presidency. In 1896 the popular vote was 13,899,587, in 1920—the first year in which women voted on a national scale—29,748,224; in 1936, 45,646,817. Technically of course these votes were cast not directly for the presidential and vice-presidential candidates themselves but for the electors of the various parties in each state. However, a ballot device invented by Massachusetts in 1928, and since adopted by fourteen other states, approximates as closely to direct popular vote as legal fiction permits.

[E. E. Robinson, *The Presidential Vote, 1896-1932*.]

ROBERT C. BROOKS

settlement the rate of growth fluctuated violently, as was but natural when the entrance of a few thousands meant increasing the total white population manyfold.

TABLE 1
POPULATION, AND AMOUNT AND RATE OF INCREASE, 1610-1930¹

Year	Population (thousands)	Increase During Decade Ending in Year Indicated		Year	Population (thousands)	Increase During Decade Ending in Year Indicated	
		Number (thousands)	Percent			Number (thousands)	Percent
1610 ²	1780	2,781	576	26 1
1620	2	2	1090 0	1790	3,929	1,148	41 3
1630	6	3	128 1	1800	5,308	1,379	35 1
1640	23	22	390 3	1810	7,240	1,931	36.4
1650	52	24	85 0	1820	9,638	2,399	33 1
1660	85	33	64.0	1830	12,866	3,228	33 5
1670	114	30	35.0	1840	17,069	4,203	32.7
1680	156	41	35.9	1850	23,192	6,122	35 9
1690	214	58	37.2	1860	31,443	8,251	35 6
1700	275	62	28.8	1870 ³	39,818	8,375	26 6
1710	358	82	30.0	1880 ³	50,156	10,337	26 0
1720	474	117	32.7	1890	62,948	12,792	25 5
1730	655	181	38.1	1900	75,995	13,047	20 7
1740	889	234	35.7	1910	91,972	15,978	21 0
1750	1,207	318	35.8	1920	105,711	13,738	14 9
1760	1,610	403	33.4	1930	122,775	17,061	16 1
1770	2,205	595	37.0				

¹ For 1610-1780, estimated population as given in Table I, p. 9, from *A Century of Population Growth, 1790-1930* from *Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930*, Vol. I, p. 6 except 1870 and 1880 (see Note ³)

² No Indians prior to 1860, civilized Indians in 1860, 1870 and 1880, all Indians from 1890 to date

³ Less than 500 population (210 in Virginia)

⁴ Data as revised by the Bureau of the Census (see *Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920*, Vol. II, pp. 15, 29)

Prior to the census of 1790 the data are no doubt open to considerable question, but, even so, they probably do not exaggerate the rate of growth since it continued at approximately 35% each decade from 1660 to 1860. The widest departure from this rate occurred during the two decades, 1770 to 1790, and may easily be due to an error

in estimates for 1780. After the Civil War the rate of increase fell to 25% for three decades, then to 20% for two decades, and after 1910 it fell to about 15%. But even so, until 1930 the rate of increase of population in the United States remained almost the highest in the world.

Unlike many countries, the United States has

always (until 1930) had a large immigrant population. Hence, during any current period its growth has been much affected by arrivals from abroad and by the high birth rates of these immigrants after settlement here. The total number of immigrants who entered the United States between 1820 and 1930 was about 38,000,000. How many of these remained is not known, but reasonable estimates of the proportion of the

growth of the white population which came from the excess of births over deaths and from immigration² during each decade show that the latter has been a factor of great importance. The following table gives the best estimates available showing the numbers and the proportions of the decennial growth in population arising from natural increase and from immigration.

TABLE 2
ESTIMATED GROWTH OF THE WHITE POPULATION FROM NATURAL INCREASE AND NET IMMIGRATION, BY
DECADES, 1800-1930¹

Decade	White Population Growth (thousands)	Natural Increase		Immigration		Adjustment Percent
		Thousands	Percent of Population Growth	Thousands	Percent of Population Growth	
1800-10.....	1,556	1,494	96.0	62	4.0	4.4
1810-20.....	2,005	1,934	96.5	71	3.5	5.2
1820-30.....	2,671	2,548	95.4	123	4.6	4.7
1830-40.....	3,658	3,165	86.5	493	13.5	5.3
1840-50.....	5,357	3,937	73.5	1,420	26.5	3.4
1850-60.....	7,369	4,811	65.3	2,558	34.7	3.6
1860-70.....	7,415	5,341	72.0	2,074	28.0	5.3
1870-80.....	9,066	6,486	71.5	2,580	28.5	2.7
1880-90.....	11,581	6,617	57.1	4,964	42.9	4.0
1890-1900.....	11,708	8,019	68.5	3,689	31.5	2.4
1900-10.....	14,923	8,680	58.2	6,243	41.8	2.8
1910-20.....	13,089	10,864	83.0	2,225	17.0	1.6
1920-30.....	15,466	12,131	78.4	3,335	21.6	0.7

¹ For method of calculation see Warren S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton, *Population Trends in the United States*, page 303

The importance of immigration in the building of the population of the United States is also shown by the estimates of the national origins of our population prepared for use in connection with the enforcement of the immigration quotas. It was estimated that of a total white population of 94,821,000 in 1920 only 41,289,000 were the descendants of people living here in 1790 while 53,532,000 were either foreign-born or the descendants of immigrants entering since 1790. Approximately 56% of our white population in 1920 came from people who settled here subsequent to 1790.

The table on page 312 shows the number of children 0-4 per 1000 women 15-44 at the several censuses beginning with 1800 and the estimated birth rate for the white population during this period.*

It is obvious from these data that the crude birth rate has been declining for more than a century. From a rate which approximated the physiological maximum of between 50 and 60 at the beginning of the 19th century, it has now

fallen to less than one third of this rate (1938). If the rate for women of childbearing age is considered, it has fallen even more below what it was in 1800. This does not mean, of course, that the rate of natural increase fell simultaneously and equally. This was not the case because the death rate and the birth rate have not fallen in like measure at all times. It appears probable that these two rates followed a more nearly parallel course during the first half of the 19th century than after the Civil War. Thus there was a relatively slow decline in rate of natural increase until about 1860. From the Civil War to about 1900, however, the birth rate and death rate did not run as nearly parallel. The death rate appears to have remained almost stationary for three or four decades while the birth rate continued to decline at a fairly rapid rate. Hence the rate of natural increase fell rapidly during this period. It has continued to fall, but its fall was somewhat stayed during the first two decades of the 20th century because of the rapid lowering of the death rate during this time and also because from 1900 until the outbreak of the World War there was a tremendous

* The lack of data for Negroes made it impracticable to make similar estimates of birth rates from ratios of children to women.

TABLE 3

RATIO OF CHILDREN TO WOMEN BY RACE, AND ESTIMATED WHITE BIRTH RATE, 1800-1930¹

Year	Children 0-4 per 1000 women 15-44		Estimated White Birth Rate ²	
	White	Negro	Per 1000 Population	Per 1000 Women 15-44
1800.....	952	55.0	278
1810.....	953	54.3	274
1820.....	905	810 ³	52.8	260
1830.....	835	830 ³	51.4	240
1840.....	797	785 ³	48.3	222
1850.....	659	741 ³	43.3	194
1860.....	675	724	41.4	184
1870.....	610	692	38.3	167
1880.....	586	759 ³	35.2	155
1890.....	517	621	31.5	137
1900.....	508	582	30.1	130
1910.....	484	519	27.4	117
1920.....	471	429	26.1	113
1930.....	386	393	20.1	87

¹ Mexicans are included with whites from 1800 to 1920, inclusive.² Estimated white births divided by the census population indicated.³ Include an unknown but probably small and unimportant proportion of other colored, for example in 1860 there were 725,051 colored children 0 to 4 and the colored ratio of children to women was 721, only slightly different from the figures for Negroes in that year.

flow into the United States of immigrants having high birth rates. By 1930 the crude rate of natural increase had fallen to about eight or nine per 1000.

This crude rate is misleading, however, because the population of the United States is a young population in which deaths are relatively few and births are relatively many. When calculations are made using the birth rates and death rates prevailing at each age it is found that instead of a natural increase of about eight or nine per 1000 we had only slightly more than enough births to maintain the population in 1930. Since then, the birth rate has fallen further so that now (1938) not enough children are being born each year to maintain our present numbers when our age make-up becomes adjusted to the specific birth rates and death rates of today.

It is probable that there was little difference in the rate of growth of population by excess of births over deaths in different communities in colonial days although there is no conclusive evidence on this point. Since 1800, however, the age data in the censuses provide clear evidence that the rate of natural increase has varied considerably from community to community.

In 1800 the states which were distinctly agricultural had 1043 children 0-4 per 1000 women 15-44 while those which were most industrialized had only 786. In 1900 the ratios were 706 and 465, respectively. In 1930 much the same differences still persisted; thus the number of children 0-4 to 1000 native white women 15-44

was 380 in the urban population, while it was 683 in the rural population.

The many studies that have been made on differential fertility in the United States may be summed up briefly as follows: (a) When different sizes of communities are compared, it is found that the smaller the community the larger the number of children there are in the family. It is also found that the poorer the community the larger is the number of children. Thus there is a steady increase in the number of children 0-4 to 1000 women 15-44 from the large cities to the small cities, to the villages, and to the rural-farm population and there are larger families in poor farming areas than in good farming areas. (b) When groups within a community are compared for fertility, the lower the level of living the larger is the ratio of children to women. Thus in cities and towns the common laborers and the workers in manufacturing have more children than the clerks, the professional people and the businessmen. In the rural areas the farm laborers and poor tenants have larger families than the farm owners.

The chief consequences of these differential birth rates are: (1) That the cities as a whole, and particularly those of over 100,000, are not now producing enough children to maintain their numbers when their age make-up becomes adjusted to their current birth rates. (2) The comfortable classes everywhere, except on the farms, are failing by a large margin (25 to 50%) to maintain themselves. Our future white population is therefore coming quite largely from those

classes and those regions where economic conditions are least favorable.

There is much less difference in the growth of the white and Negro populations than might be expected. The Negro population has grown a little, but only a little, faster than the white population of colonial stock. At present Negro death rates are usually considerably higher than white death rates in the same communities. Negro birth rates in rural areas are apparently not much different from those of the poorer whites who live under somewhat similar conditions. In the cities, on the other hand, the Negro birth rate is generally lower than that of the whites of similar economic status, so that urban Negroes are failing to reproduce by an even larger margin than urban whites. It appears probable that all future increase among Negroes will come from those who remain in the rural South.

[U. S. Bureau of the Census, *A Century of Population Growth from the First Census of the United States to the Twelfth, 1790 to 1900*; Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, *American Population before the Federal Census of 1790*; American Council of Learned Societies, Committee on Linguistic and National Stocks in the Population of the United States, Report in *American Historical Association, Annual Report, 1931*, Vol. 1; Warren S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton, *Population Trends in the United States*.]

WARREN S. THOMPSON

Populism and Urban Labor (1890-96). Until 1894 organized labor held aloof from Populism, antagonized by the Omaha platform's failure to approve the eight-hour day and trade-union movement. When hard times and defeat induced the American Federation of Labor²⁷ to consider (December, 1893) sponsoring an independent labor party, Populist²⁸ leaders of the Old Northwest, where Populism was weak, sought to usher labor bodily into its ranks. Urban radicals likewise sought to form a "popular front." Bitterness over defeat of the Pullman strike²⁹ led many unions to support the movement.

By expanding its platforms to satisfy organized labor, Socialists and Single-taxers, to the extent of endorsing collective ownership of the means of production and distribution in Wisconsin and Illinois, the People's party won significant gains in Chicago, Minneapolis, Milwaukee and Cleveland. A brilliant campaign in Cook County, Ill., netted 30,000 votes (1894).

In no Midwestern city did the coalition win control. Defeat and factional struggles between constituent reform elements weakened it steadily (1895-96). An effort to nominate Eugene V. Debs for President and secure a platform palatable to labor, led by Henry D. Lloyd, failed at the St. Louis Convention (July, 1896), and dis-

solved the alliance between Populism and urban labor.

[C. M. Destler, *The People's Party of Illinois, 1888-96*, unpublished dissertation, University of Chicago; J. M. Klotsche, *The "United Front" Populists, in Wisconsin Magazine of History, XX.*]

CHESTER MCA. DESTLER

Populist Party, THE, grew out of the deflation of the late 1880's and early 1890's as an agrarian protest against falling prices, poor credit and marketing facilities, and crop failures. The members of Farmers' Alliance³⁰ and other organizations were driven into politics by these conditions. The campaign of 1890 found them active in the Democratic party in the South, while those in the West sponsored independent parties. As a result, nine congressmen and two senators went to Washington as party-conscious agrarians.

These same elements united to form the People's party, as it was officially called, at a convention in Omaha in July, 1892. Its platform embodied the demands of the alliances, and its resolutions included labor legislation and proposals for a more direct political democracy. In the subsequent campaign, its most effective issue was the free coinage of silver³¹, on which the major parties had each adopted a straddle plank. After failing to secure Judge Walter Q. Gresham as a presidential candidate, James B. Weaver was named and a vigorous campaign instituted. Over 1,000,000 votes were cast for Weaver, and he received 22 electoral votes, including all votes from Kansas, Colorado, Idaho and Nevada, and one vote each from North Dakota and Oregon. Small delegations went to the House and Senate, and a generous sprinkling of state officials was elected.

As economic conditions grew worse (*see* Panic of 1893), the support for the party program seemed to grow. An energetic campaign in 1894 was indecisive, for the party found itself handicapped by the widespread support of the Populist program by Democratic and Republican candidates in those states where these ideas were popular. The prospects for 1896 seemed much brighter, especially if neither major party endorsed free silver as seemed probable. The complete victory of the silver Democrats over the Cleveland administration at Chicago in 1896 destroyed these prospects. The Democrats declared for free coinage and nominated Bryan (*see* Campaign of 1896).

With the Republican party³² committed to the gold standard³³, the Populists had a choice of either placing a third candidate in the field and thereby helping to defeat free coinage, or en-

dorsing Bryan and thereby killing their own organization by merging it with the larger Democratic party⁷. The long struggle at their convention was over this issue, with the Southern delegates against the fusion and the Westerners for it. The resulting compromise favored fusion as it provided for the nomination of Bryan, and a separate Populist candidate for Vice-President.

The defeat of Bryan marked the end of the effectiveness of the Populists, although representatives of the party stayed in Congress for several years. The majority faction of the party nominated Bryan again in 1900, but its support was no longer important. Still less so were the remnants which placed candidates in the field in 1904.

The significance of the Populists lies in their agitation of most of the causes which later became part of the progressive movement⁷. Then, too, the third party tended to break up major party regularity, and many who left the locally dominant party to vote Populist remained independents, or they affiliated later with the alternative major party, Republican in the South, and Democratic in the West.

[J. D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt*]

ELMER ELLIS

Porcupine's Gazette (March 4, 1797, to Oct. 26, 1799) was a daily and triweekly newspaper published at Philadelphia by William Cobbett ("Peter Porcupine"), a vituperative British journalist who advocated alliance with England, war against France and freely attacked many prominent citizens. Loss of a libel suit for \$5000, instituted by Dr. Benjamin Rush during the yellow fever⁷ epidemic, caused his failure and he retreated to England in 1800.

[Clarence S. Brigham, *Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820*, in *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, XXXII.]

JULIAN P. BOYD

"Pork Barrel," a familiar term in American politics, connotes grants of public money for unnecessary local projects rather than for needed public improvements. It is regarded as a reward for party services, graft by legislation. The term is derived from old Southern plantation days when it was the custom to set aside a definite portion of the pork for the slaves. This was distributed to them from time to time as they eagerly assembled around the pork barrel.

To "get his pork" the average member of Congress follows his party leaders on significant public bills. In return, appropriations benefiting doubtful or strategic states and districts receive careful consideration by the majority party. Each

project is an opportunity for legislative bargaining and logrolling⁷. Subjected to the severest pressure by communities in the home district, by organized minority groups, and by the party machine, the congressman dares not ignore the "pork" nor disapprove the methods. To do so would require courage and would incur antagonism and jeopardize his political future. Therefore, he is tempted to get as much government aid as he can for his district. His tenure is too apt to depend upon this.

Constituents are prone to judge their congressman, not by his ability to deal with significant national questions, but upon his success in getting special appropriations, as distinct from general appropriations, for local river and harbor improvements, post-office buildings, roads and canals, unemployment relief, farm relief, army posts, pensions, bonus⁷ and what not. Public building and river and harbor appropriations have always been the important "pork" in the "barrel." The community will remember the appropriation and little consider the cost or need, and the party organization will gain popular favor and strengthen its position.

The struggle for public funds from the "pork barrel" has occurred many times in national and state affairs. Naturally, controversies always arise as to whether a particular bill constitutes "pork barrel legislation" or not. Specifically denounced and criticized by recognized authorities, nevertheless the abuse continues. Appropriations for projects have been too often determined on the basis of spoils⁷ rather than merit.

Another factor contributing to the "pork barrel" has been the division of responsibility regarding the framing of appropriation bills. The first Congress made the Secretary of the Treasury responsible for preparing the budget, estimating revenues and expenditures. Early in the 19th century the new House Committee on Ways and Means was assigned this task. In 1865 the Committee on Appropriations was created and after 1885 its work divided among a number of committees. By 1920 nine such committees existed in the House and fifteen in the Senate. Anticipating the budget⁷ system, the House in 1920 gave its enlarged appropriations committee jurisdiction over all appropriation bills. In 1923 the Senate made corresponding changes.

[James Bryce, *Modern Democracies*, Charles A. Beard and William Beard, *The American Leviathan*.]

GLENN H. BENTON

Port Gibson, Battle at (May 1, 1863). Gen. McClelland's van of Grant's flank movement on Vicksburg⁷ struck Bowen's outnumbered Confederates on a divided road ten miles from

Bruinsburg. Dual attacks were checked in bitter fighting, until McClernand's last reserve hit the southern flank while Grant personally directed reinforcements from McPherson's corps against the northern. Bowen's brigades got away to Grand Gulf.

[F. V. Greene, *The Mississippi*.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Port Hudson, Siege of. Following the battle of Baton Rouge[™], Aug. 5, 1862, Breckinridge (C.) occupied the high bluff at Port Hudson, twenty-five miles to the north, which was strongly fortified during the next few months to protect Confederate supplies coming down Red River. Farragut attacked Port Hudson on March 14, 1863, in an attempt to join Grant before Vicksburg, but only two gunboats succeeded in passing the fortifications, the others being disabled or driven back. While Grant invested Vicksburg[™], Banks besieged Port Hudson for six weeks. The fall of Vicksburg rendered Port Hudson useless to the Confederates, and on July 9, 1863, Gardner surrendered this last stronghold on the Mississippi.

[J. C. Ropes and W. R. Livermore, *The Story of the Civil War*, Part III, *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. III.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Port Republic, Battle of (June 9, 1862). After his defeat of Frémont (U.) at Cross Keys[™], the Confederate commander, "Stonewall" Jackson, hurried to Port Republic, destroyed the bridge across the Shenandoah there, thus dividing Frémont's force, and on the following day, after a hard fight, defeated the two Federal brigades south of the river, numerically much inferior to his own force (see Jackson's Valley Campaign).

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. II.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Port Royal, on the Annapolis Basin, Nova Scotia, was the most important outpost of the French in Acadia[™] against colonial New England. The earliest settlement of the name was begun across the Basin in 1605 by Sieur DeMonts, deserted in 1608, reoccupied in 1610, and destroyed by Capt. Argall from Virginia in 1613. French settlers were, however, left in the vicinity. The Huguenot Claude de la Tour brought some Scotch settlers in 1630 in behalf of Sir William Alexander to whom Charles I of England had granted the region, calling it Nova Scotia. Charles D'Aulnay obtained control in 1636, moved the fort to the site of the present town in 1643, and began a long rivalry with La Tour's son Charles, who, as governor of the

French fort St. Louis at St. John, controlled much of the trade. On D'Aulnay's death in 1650 La Tour had possession until the place was captured by a New England expedition under Maj. Robert Sedgwick in 1654. Returned to the French in 1670, Port Royal in 1684 became the seat of their government in Acadia. It was the center from which they attacked New England shipping and the scene of much illicit trade with New Englanders. Captured by Sir William Phips in 1690 it was restored to the French by the Treaty of Ryswick[™], 1697. Several times threatened with attack from Boston, which in turn lived in daily fear of attack by a French fleet using Port Royal as a base, the town was finally taken by a great expedition in 1710 under Col. Nicholson and Col. Vetch (see Queen Anne's War). Acadia was ceded to England by the Treaty of Utrecht[™]. In the face of the Acadian citizenry, England's hold was precarious after the French built Louisbourg[™] on Cape Breton Island. Twice attacked and several times threatened in King George's War[™], Annapolis Royal (as it was called by the English) lost its strategic importance and also its position as seat of the government with the building of Halifax by the English at the close of the war.

[W. M. MacVicar, *A Short History of Annapolis Royal*.]

ROBERT E. MOODY

Port Royal (South Carolina). The French diplomat, soldier and Huguenot leader Jean Ribaut in May, 1562, settled twenty-eight or thirty Frenchmen, almost all Huguenots, on Parris Island in present South Carolina, and named the harbor containing the island Port Royal from its size. It lies twenty miles north of the mouth of Savannah River. Spanish navigators from Mexico and West Indies had already named the harbor Santa Elena and continued so to call it. Ribaut having gone to France for reinforcements (see Florida, French in), the settlers, soon discouraged, abandoned their frail fortification Charlesfort (confused by some writers with Fort Caroline on the St. Johns, Fla.), and after fearful sufferings, including slaying and eating one of their number, reached France after being rescued from a vessel of their own construction. Spain to prevent further trespass in the region built St. Augustine[™], 1565, destroyed the French Fort Caroline, built in 1564 on the St. Johns, and built Fort San Felipe on Parris Island, Port Royal, 1566, introduced farmers and missionaries, and explored the interior as far as the North Carolina mountains and eastern Alabama. Indians expelled the Spaniards and burned their fort in 1576, but in 1577 Spain rebuilt near the

same spot on Parris Island under the name Fort San Marcos Drake's burning St. Augustine in 1586 forced Spain's abandonment that year of Port Royal. The English who under the authority of the Lords Proprietors of Carolina^o settled South Carolina^o in 1670 landed at Port Royal, but in a few days removed to the site of Charleston^o as in less danger from the Spaniards. In 1684 fifty-one Scotch Covenanters settled at Port Royal, but were driven off by Spaniards from St. Augustine in 1686.

The modern town of Port Royal, immediately above Parris Island, was captured Nov. 7, 1861, by a Federal fleet. The region became the scene for raising Negro Federal troops and for Northern missionary enterprises. The Federal Navy Yard was removed to Charleston in 1901-2.

[Jeanette T. Connor, *Jean Ribault*, Woodbury Lowery, *Spanish Settlements within the Present Limits of the United States*; D. D. Wallace, *History of South Carolina*]

D. D. WALLACE

Portages and Water Routes. Foremost among the factors which governed the exploration and settlement of the country were the mountain and the river systems, the former an obstacle, the latter an aid to travel. The English, who settled on the Atlantic coastal plain, were barred from the interior by the great wall of the Allegheny Mountains, and over a century was required to scale it and begin the descent of its western slope. The French, securing a foothold about the same time at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, found themselves on a waterway which offered ready access to the interior. By the Richelieu River-Lake Champlain route they might pass southward to the Hudson, while numerous tributaries of the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence pointed the way to Hudson Bay. The humbling of the Iroquois (1666-67) opened the direct route to Lake Ontario, from which, save for the interruption at Niagara, more than a thousand miles of lake navigation invited the traveler (*see* Great Lakes).

Over the entire eastern half of primitive America stretched a forest, penetrated only by the winding river or the narrow trail. Wherever rivers ran, boats could be propelled, and the Indian canoe^o supplied a craft admirably adapted to the exigencies of wilderness travel—light in weight and constructed of materials almost everywhere available. But travel by water was subject to interruption, either by rapids, shallows or falls in a river, or at points where the transit from one river system to another must be made. At such places, boat and cargo must be carried around the obstruction or across the intervening land. The term "portage" signifies both the act

of transporting a boat and its cargo overland, and the place where such a land carriage is necessary. At places where the volume of travel was considerable, either the natives or some white trader frequently maintained horses or oxen and carts for hauling boats across the portage.

The Ottawa River route to the Upper Lakes^o was opened by the French at an early date (Champlain, 1615-16). From Lake Erie the Ohio River might be reached by numerous routes: the Lake Chautauqua Portage to the Allegheny (at Warren, Pa.), the Presque Isle-Allegheny Portage (at Erie), the Maumee-Miami and the Maumee-Wabash (at Fort Wayne, Ind.) portages. From Lake Huron access to Lake Superior by the St. Marys River or to Lake Michigan by the Straits of Mackinac (*see* Michilimackinac) was open. From Lake Superior one might pass by numerous river and portage routes to Hudson Bay, to the Mississippi River system, or to the great river systems which drain the vast interior plain of Canada into the Arctic. From Lake Michigan many routes led to the Mississippi system, the best-known portages being the Fox-Wisconsin^o at Portage, Wis.; the Chicago-Illinois at Chicago (*see* Chicago Portage); and the St. Joseph-Kankakee at South Bend, Ind. (*see* St. Joseph, Fort); while from the St. Joseph access was open to the Wabash and the Ohio.

With the Mississippi system once gained, the entire heart of the continent from the Arctic to the Gulf of Mexico and westward to the Rockies lay open to the traveler. The encirclement of the English by the French precipitated the French and Indian War^o, ending in the conquest of New France^o and the division of its territory between England and Spain (*see* Paris, Treaty of, 1763), but the waterways retained their importance as highways of trade and travel to the end of the wilderness period. At places where a break in transportation occurred (Niagara, Erie, Fort Wayne, Chicago, etc.) forts were frequently placed and the foundations of future cities laid. Places like Detroit and Mackinac^o owed their importance to their strategic location at points where the travel of a vast area centered.

Compared with modern standards, wilderness travel at best was laborious and time-consuming. If some rivers were deep and placid, others were swift and beset with shoals and rapids. Portage conditions, too, varied widely from place to place, or even at the same place under different seasonal conditions. Céloron^o in 1749 consumed five days of arduous toil in traversing the ten-mile portage from Lake Erie to Lake Chautauqua, and two weeks in reaching the Allegheny at Warren; while a Detroit merchant traveling by the wa-

terways across Michigan to Chicago in 1790 required forty-eight days to reach his destination; and Lewis and Clark⁹⁹ in 1805 spent almost a month in making a portage of eighteen miles at Great Falls, Mont. The fact that travel clung to the waterways under circumstances of such difficulty affords striking evidence of the still greater obstacles encountered by land.

[A. B. Hulbert, *Portage Paths, the Keys of the Continent*; Seymour Dunbar, *A History of Travel in America.*]

M. M. QUAIFFÉ

Porter Case. Gen. Fitz-John Porter was considered one of the ablest and best Union generals and was one of McClellan's most intimate friends. On Nov. 27, 1862, he was arraigned before a court-martial in Washington, D. C., and charged with disobeying the orders of Gen. John Pope during the second battle of Bull Run⁹⁹. On June 21, 1863, Porter was found guilty and "forever disqualified from holding any office of trust or profit under the government of the United States." This verdict was the cause of much controversy until twenty-three years later when a bill was passed by Congress and signed by President Cleveland which restored Porter to the Army of the United States on Aug. 7, 1886, with the rank of colonel. It has been charged that Porter was used as a scapegoat upon which to vent the revenge of the Radical Republicans⁹⁹ and other enemies of McClellan.

[J. F. Rhodes, *History of the United States*, Vol. IV; W. S. Myers, *General George Brinton McClellan.*]

WILLIAM STARR MYERS

Portsmouth, N. H. See Strawberry Bank.

Portsmouth, The Treaty of (Sept. 5, 1905), brought to a close the Russo-Japanese War and gave formal sanction to Japan's supplanting of Russian interests and political influence in Korea and southern Manchuria. It represented Japan's first forward step in territorial expansion on the Asiatic mainland. From the opening of the peace negotiations Russia had agreed to cede the special rights the Czarist government held in southern Manchuria (notably the Liaotung Peninsula lease and what was to be called the South Manchuria Railway), but the conference almost broke up over Japan's demand for the further cession of the island of Sakhalin and payment of an indemnity. At this point President Theodore Roosevelt, whose earlier intercession had been instrumental in bringing about the conference and for its being held in Portsmouth, N. H., again intervened, and both directly and through the German Kaiser he brought such pressure as he could on the Russian and Japanese governments in favor of peace. As a result, Russia, while

refusing to pay any indemnity, agreed to cede the southern half of Sakhalin, and Japan accepted these terms. Roosevelt was widely hailed for his contribution to peace (see Nobel Prizes), but bitter resentment was created in Japan through loss of the expected indemnity.

[Tyler Dennett, *Roosevelt and the Russo-Japanese War.*]

FOSTER RHEA DULLES

Post Exchanges, Army, originated in trading establishments of the Revolution, which were operated for ninety years on military reservations by civilian concessionaires called sutlers⁹⁹. These were abolished by Congress in 1866, but re-established ten years later for operation by civilian post traders.

In isolated posts officers established canteens for themselves (extended to enlisted men in 1889) which became so successful as nonprofit stores that post traders were abolished by Congress in 1893 and post exchanges commenced.

Post exchanges are not financed from government funds but operated under strict army supervision for officers and men.

[*Official Archives of War Department.*]

LELAND P. LOVETTE

Post Office Department. The postal organization which existed under the Confederation⁹⁹ was continued in force temporarily under the new Constitution by act of Sept. 22, 1789. Further legislation in 1792, 1794 and 1799 placed the service on a more permanent basis. The administrative office at the seat of Government was known in those early years as the "General Post Office," following British usage, and the entire system was referred to usually as the "Post Office Establishment." After 1825 the Post Office began to be referred to as a "Department" but not until the revision of the statutes in 1874 was it officially designated as an executive department of the Government. Although an independent officer, subject only to the President from the first, the Postmaster General was not a member of the Cabinet until invited to become so by President Jackson in 1829. Because of the immense patronage controlled by the head of the department, particularly in the appointment of thousands of postmasters, there has been a tendency to appoint to the office political lieutenants of the party in power. (See also Postal Service.)

[W. E. Rich, *The History of the U. S. Post Office to the Year 1829*; D. C. Roper, *The United States Post Office.*]

OLIVER W. HOLMES

Post Roads. The earliest colonial mail carrying, between New York and Boston, and later, be-

tween New York and Albany, in the latter 17th century, traced routes which became great highways and are still known as the Post Roads. The names "Boston Post Road" and "Old (Albany) Post Road" on two meandering streets in New York City mark their lower courses. The Continental Congress^m began creating post roads during the Revolutionary War. To designate a highway as a post road gave the Government the monopoly of carrying mail over it, on other roads, anybody might carry it. At first the mail was conveyed on horseback; later in stagecoaches. But as late as 1825 the Postmaster General reported that "The intelligence of more than half the Nation is conveyed on horseback." That a highway was a post road did not prevent its being impassable from mud at times, for little road improving was done in the early decades of our history. Hugh Finley, postal inspector, declared in 1773, for example, that the road between New London and Providence was "bad past all conception." In early days, horseback travelers often sought the company of the post rider for guidance and protection, later, the mail coach was an important passenger carrier as well. The inns where the post rider stopped overnight or the mail coach paused for meals became noted and prosperous hostleries, and the post roads were the first to be improved. In 1787 connecting stretches of road reaching as far north as Portsmouth and Concord, N. H., as far south as Augusta, Ga., and as far west as Pittsburgh were declared post roads, not to mention others in the more settled area between; but many of the new routes were not expected to be self-supporting, and so were let out to contractors. Between 1790 and 1829 successive acts of Congress increased the post road mileage from 1875 to 114,780. Steamboat captains carried many letters in early days and collected the fees therefor, until in 1823 all navigable waters were declared to be post roads, which checked the practice. Private letter-carrying companies after 1842 did much house-to-house mail business in the larger cities; but the Postmaster General circumvented them in 1860 by declaring all the streets of New York, Boston and Philadelphia to be post roads.

[Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Post Bags*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Postage Stamps. Although adhesive stamps were invented in Great Britain in 1840, their use in the United States was not authorized until 1845, and even then, Congress made no provision for printing them. During the two following years, a number of postmasters produced their own stamps, each in individual design, which

are now among the greatest of philatelic rarities. On July 1, 1847, the Post Office Department issued its first stamps—a five-cent bearing the head of Franklin and a ten-cent (Washington)—and ordered all the postmaster stamps destroyed. Letter postage was then five cents per ounce. Meanwhile, there had been a great number of local delivery companies who—as the Government had no house-to-house delivery—carried mail in the larger cities and had their own stamps. One of these, the United States Despatch Post, issued in 1842 the first adhesive stamp used in America. Express companies even carried mail between cities in the East, and during the California Gold Rush^m and for two decades thereafter in the Far West, though only three or four of them used adhesive stamps. The Pony Express^m of 1860–61 had its own stamps. With the second issue (1851) of United States stamps, rates were reduced, and 1-, 3-, 5-, 10- and 12-cent values were issued; in 1856, 24-, 30- and 90-cent denominations appeared. Thereafter, other denominations were added from time to time. During perhaps two decades in these early years, stamps were often used as currency, for making purchases, paying street-car fares, etc. When the Confederate government was set up in 1861, there was a brief period when local post-offices printed their own stamps before the government issue appeared.

Up to 1873 government mail was franked without stamps (*see* Franking). For a decade thereafter the various government departments used stamps, each in its own design, at the regular postal rates, then these were dropped and the plain franked envelope returned. In 1869 the first stamps printed in two colors appeared—a novelty not repeated until 1901. In 1893 the first commemorative series appeared—large stamps in sixteen denominations, all picturing Columbus and the discovery of America, in celebration of the World's Columbian Exposition^m. The Trans-Mississippi Exposition^m of 1898 brought another series of nine; the Pan-American Exposition^m of 1901 a bicolored series of six values. Thereafter, commemoratives increased in popularity, and by 1930 and after, floods of them in rich designs were pouring from the presses at brief intervals. In 1913 a special series of stamps for parcel-post^m service was issued, but after 1917 these were discarded and the ordinary stamps used on packages. The inauguration of air mail^m in 1918 caused the designing of a 24-cent air stamp for letters; and as rates were thereafter reduced, air stamps in various denominations were issued. By 1938 there was a stamp for every value from 1/2 cent (and

including 1½ cents) up to and including 22 cents, and others thereafter up to \$5; and in that year a complete series bearing the portraits of the deceased Presidents from Washington to Coolidge (there is a rule against using the portraits of living persons on stamps) was begun—Franklin's portrait being placed on the ½-cent, Martha Washington's on the 1½-cent and the White House on the 4½-cent to complete the series. When we took over the Panama Canal Zone and the Philippine Islands⁹⁹, our low-value stamps were surcharged or overprinted with their names for use in those possessions. The increasing volume of stamp sales to collectors, and the philatelists' special requisites, caused the opening for their benefit at Washington in 1921 of a Government Philatelic Agency, whose yearly business has since grown enormously.

[John N. Luff, *Postage Stamps of the United States*; Beverly S. King and Max G. Johl, *The United States Postage Stamps of the Twentieth Century*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Postal Power, The Judicial History of, connotes the interpretation by the courts of the constitutional provision giving Congress the power to "establish post-offices and post-roads." A Federal Supreme Court judge has said that from the beginning the provision was construed "to authorize not merely the designation of the routes over which the mail shall be carried and the offices where letters and other documents shall be received to be distributed or forwarded, but the carriage of the mail, and all measures necessary to secure its safe and speedy transit, and the prompt delivery of its contents." The postal power is exclusive in the Federal Government and exists as a monopoly right. The United States has a property right in the mails. The postal power and this property right may be protected by resort to courts of equity, save as the use of injunctions in Federal courts has been restricted by Federal statute—as in the instance of labor controversies.

Within the limits defined by the Bill of Rights⁹⁹, Congress may prescribe what is and what is not mailable, and may classify materials and establish differential rates. Public interest may justify rate discrimination, as in the case of the second class classification given to newspapers on the ground of their value in promoting public intelligence. As a corollary of this concession Congress may require newspapers sent second class to publish facts concerning ownership, management and circulation. Congress lawfully excludes from the mails communications which are obscene, indecent or immoral; which are defamatory or threatening in character; which

involve lottery schemes; and which are sent with the intention to defraud. The power has far-reaching implications, in the fact, for example, that the mailing of corporation securities is illegal unless the securities have been registered with the Federal Government; and the facilities of the mails may be denied to utility-holding companies which fail to register with the Federal Government as provided by law.

[Lindsay Rogers, *The Postal Power of Congress: A Study in Constitutional Expansion*.]

CARL BRENT SWISHER

Postal Savings Banks have long been widely used in European countries. But it was not until June 25, 1910, that provision was made for a system in the United States. The delay was due to the opposition of the private banks doing a savings business. This opposition was strong enough to put provisions in the law which would reduce the competition of the Postal Savings Banks to a minimum. The arguments which had weight in getting the bill passed were that it would benefit all banks by bringing out hoarded money, that immigrants were accustomed to postal savings banks in their own countries and that many parts of the country had no savings banks. The growth of the system was hampered by the limitation of the amount that could be deposited by one person, \$1000 at the start (now \$2500) and the low rate of interest paid, 2%. The funds are deposited in banks or invested in United States Government securities. After fluctuating around \$150,000,000 from 1919 to 1929, the deposits rose to about \$1,200,000,000 in 1933 and have remained there. This increase has been caused by the distrust of the private banks due to bank failures⁹⁹.

[Roy L. Garis, *Principles of Money, Credit, and Banking*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Postal Service. When the Federal Constitution became operative, there were in the United States scarcely 2400 miles of post roads⁹⁹, of which the greater part was represented by a "main post road" paralleling the Atlantic coast from Maine to Georgia. Less than a dozen "cross posts" branched from this trunk route. There were but seventy-six post offices, of which fifty-one were along the main post road. The annual gross revenues of the entire "Post Office Establishment" were under \$25,000, which meant that 3,000,000 people were sending less than 250,000 letters per year. Great portions of the country, including all rural areas, were without official postal service and had to send and receive mail by private means.

Some Federalists, particularly Hamilton, expected the Post Office to be a revenue-producing

agency which would each year turn into the Treasury a profit on its operations. This view was challenged by those who argued that any surplus should be used to extend and render more efficient so useful a service, with the profitable eastern routes helping to support those on the frontiers. The latter principle was put into full effect by the Jeffersonians. The mileage of official post roads reached 20,000 by 1801, in 1812 it was over 50,000. Expansion at a still greater rate followed the close of the War of 1812 as the Post Office made an effort to serve adequately vast areas of new settlement in the Ohio Valley and the Old Southwest.

Stagecoaches⁷⁰, first employed in 1785 as carriers of the mail on the main post roads, reached their heyday in the Jacksonian era. The first contracts for railroad service were let in 1835, and railroads⁷¹ thereafter were used as carriers as rapidly as they were constructed. The costs of railroad transportation were much higher, however, while at the same time, the railroads brought into existence a host of express companies, which, challenging the supposed constitutional monopoly of the Post Office, carried letters between the large eastern cities at bargain rates, skimming the cream of the business. The expresses flourished because of the high official postage rates. The charge for a "single letter," i.e. a single sheet, ranged from six cents for a hundred miles to twenty-five cents for over four hundred miles. Another sheet or an enclosure doubled the postage and additional sheets and enclosures increased the amount proportionately. The competition from expresses came when under Jacksonian auspices frontier routes had been vastly extended and also when, following the Panic of 1837⁷², there was stagnation in business. A series of annual deficits resulted. As postal facilities were curtailed, revenues declined further. The people sided with the expresses, and in 1843 a powerful press and congressional faction demanded the abolition of the Post Office as an "odious monopoly." The service was saved in this crisis only by "cheap postage," a reform forced through Congress in 1845 by popular pressure over strong protests from postal officials who argued that the reform would not succeed in a country of great distances and sparse population. Cheap postage, however, at once eliminated the competition of the express companies. In two years the department was again on a paying basis, and in 1851 postage rates were further reduced, reaching a level substantially the same as that existing at the present time. The old rates had actually operated as an almost prohibitive tax upon communication. Hardly two letters a

year per person were sent through the mails in 1835 in contrast to about 150 letters or cards per person in 1938. Payment of postage was simplified by the introduction of postage stamps⁷³ in 1847, and the general use of envelopes followed.

Railroads increased the speed of the mail only to have it delayed at overtaxed central distributing offices. Successful experiments in distributing on board trains in 1864 led to the establishment of the Railway Mail Service in 1865. The first ocean-mail contracts were authorized in 1845. Previously, foreign mails had been dispatched as opportunity offered, postmasters at the ports making the arrangements. Between 1847 and 1874 postal treaties regulating the exchange of mails were negotiated with many nations; these were replaced for the most part by the International Postal Convention of Berne, 1874. The registry service, designed to provide special security for letters containing money or other valuable matter, was established in 1855. The Money Order system, which went into operation in 1864, largely eliminated "money letters" from the mails and provided a convenient and safe method of transferring funds.

Gradually the Post Office has expanded its services to an extent undreamed of in the days of the "cheap postage" controversy. Free city delivery service was inaugurated in 1863. The Special Delivery service dates from 1885. In 1896, over much opposition and at great cost, the Rural Free Delivery⁷⁴ service was established, lessening the isolation of farm dwellers. Also, of special benefit to the farmer was the Parcel Post⁷⁵ service, which came into existence in 1913 despite the opposition of express companies and of retail establishments in country villages. The Parcel Post law represented a major enlargement of Post Office functions. The Postal Savings⁷⁶ system, established in 1911, had less relation to the mail function, but represented a further development of the banking facilities provided by the Money Order system.

Air mail⁷⁷ was inaugurated in 1918 with an experimental line between Washington and New York. By 1920 a transcontinental service was in operation. The Post Office Department financed and operated its own planes and ground facilities until the service had developed to a point where private capital was encouraged to enter the field. Most of the routes were placed under contract to private companies in 1927 and 1928. Foreign air mail routes were added to the domestic system until the service reached into Canada, Mexico, Central and South America, the West Indies and Bermuda. In 1935 the transpacific air mail was inaugurated via Hawaii and the Philip-

pires to China. Transatlantic service was begun in 1939. As rates were reduced, the volume of air mail grew tremendously until in 1938 the air mail branch of the service first operated at a profit.

[D. C. Roper, *The United States Post Office*; Clyde Kelly, *United States Postal Policy*.] OLIVER W. HOLMES

Postal Service, Colonial. A monopoly of the carriage of letters for profit in the American colonies was granted by Great Britain in 1691 to Thomas Neale, who never came to America, but appointed as his deputy Andrew Hamilton, governor of New Jersey. By 1697 Hamilton had organized a line of post riders, who traveled weekly in both directions, from Portsmouth, N. H., via Boston, New London, New Haven, New York, Perth Amboy, Burlington and Philadelphia, to New Castle in Delaware. Extension to Maryland and Virginia was considered, but in a report made in 1699 Hamilton expressed an opinion that scarcely one hundred letters yearly would be exchanged between Virginia and the Northern colonies. In 1707 the rights of Neale's heirs to the post office monopoly were purchased by the British government and the colonial service was thenceforth managed by the General Post Office in London. There was no extension of facilities; instead, in 1714 there was a reduction of winter service from weekly to fortnightly, which arrangement continued until 1753. Not until 1732 when Alexander Spotswood became deputy postmaster general for the colonies was the line of riders extended to Virginia. As late as 1750 the southern service was irregular, the rider for Williamsburg waiting at Philadelphia until enough letters had accumulated to pay his wages.

Benjamin Franklin was appointed deputy postmaster general, jointly with William Hunter of Virginia in 1753. Franklin had served as post office controller for the colonies and for fifteen years as postmaster at Philadelphia so that he brought to the office a practical knowledge of conditions. He restored weekly service throughout the year. In 1764 three trips a week each way were provided between Philadelphia and New York. Soon thereafter service twice a week was established between New York and Boston. When Canada became a British possession Franklin journeyed to Quebec and arranged for a monthly post by way of Montreal to New York. From Virginia to the Carolinas, however, there was no regular land mail in the colonial period.

The colonial post office first showed an excess of receipts over expenditures in 1757; and it continued to do so each year thereafter until

the Revolution. Colonial postage rates were altered a number of times, but generally averaged between 5d and 6d for the first hundred miles, with increased distances in proportion, until 1765, after which date the charge was but 2d for each additional hundred miles.

Many inhabitants living at a distance from the single main line of riders had little benefit from the official service. Private riders, usually first employed to distribute newspapers, which in colonial days were not considered part of the mails, began to carry letters and do general errands for the more populous of these unserved areas. After the Stamp Act⁷⁷ the Parliamentary office became increasingly unpopular, because it was quoted as a precedent in the argument that Parliament had power to tax the colonists. Competing private channels of communication came into existence, encouraged by Sons of Liberty and Committees of Correspondence⁷⁸, who feared to use official facilities. William Goddard, a Baltimore newspaper publisher, in 1774 organized this loose competition into a connected service. By the middle of 1775 the British system was starved out of existence, and on July 26, 1775, the Continental Congress⁷⁹ established the Continental Post Office.

[William Smith, *The History of the Post Office in British North America*.] OLIVER W. HOLMES

Postal Service, Confederate. The Provisional Congress of the Confederate States⁸⁰ on Feb. 20, 1861, passed an act establishing a Post Office Department in the Confederate government: on March 6 John H. Reagan of Texas was appointed Postmaster General. When the Postmaster General of the United States by proclamation, effective June 1, suspended postal service in the seceded states, Reagan by proclamation announced that his department would assume responsibility for, and control of, the mails. Every effort was made to avoid derangement or suspension of facilities: the same postmasters and contractors, wherever they were willing to serve, were retained. Postage rates were raised and expenses were cut so that the service became self-sustaining. The Confederacy always found it difficult to send and receive foreign mail, much of it having to be sent on blockade-runners⁸¹ by roundabout routes. After the Union forces split the Confederacy by opening the Mississippi to the sea, communication between the eastern and western parts became uncertain, and it was found necessary to establish a branch office in Texas to supervise service in the western area.

[August Dietz, *The Postal Service of the Confederate States of America*.] OLIVER W. HOLMES

Postal Telegraph Company, THE, was organized June 21, 1881, with Elisha Gray's harmonic telegraph and a new patented wire as its chief assets. In 1883 John W. Mackay became interested and was elected president. The company was placed in receivership in 1884 and reorganized in 1886. Through Mackay's business genius, it rapidly extended its lines and became the major rival to the Western Union^{co}. In 1928 it became a part of the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, though retaining its own corporate identity.

[Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Wires and New Waves*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Postal Union, The Universal. Upon the suggestion of Postmaster General Montgomery Blair, delegates of fifteen nations met in 1863 at Paris to consider the problem of international transit of mail. At this meeting the need for reform was shown. In 1874 twenty-two countries sent delegates to a postal congress at Berne where a treaty was signed. By this treaty, which became generally effective on July 1, 1875, rates for letters and commercial material were fixed and the details of organization were arranged. The United States, the European countries, Egypt, British India and the French colonial possessions were originally included in the Postal Union. Since that time postal congresses have frequently met and other countries have become members of the Union.

[John Fairfield Sly, *The Genesis of the Universal Postal Union, International Conciliation*, October, 1927; Benjamin Akzin, *Membership in the Universal Postal Union, American Journal of International Law*, Vol. 27.]

I. HOWELL KANE

Posts, Army Supply. Before the development of modern transportation the War Department^{co} found it difficult to provision army posts, many of which were located at great distances from settled communities. To offset high shipping costs, the Government advertised its contracts yearly in papers throughout the country, for in that way some bidder close to a post would probably submit a reasonable offer. Consequently, merchants everywhere had an opportunity to bid for the privilege of supplying pork, flour, whiskey, beans, vinegar, soap and other needed items. Not all contracts went to merchants, but they obtained a large percentage because of their advantageous position. Thus, during the year merchants acquired considerable farm produce in barter for goods; they were familiar with the problem of transporting supplies; and they knew the best markets in which to purchase articles

unobtainable locally. These factors, added to the advantages already held by merchants residing in the vicinity of posts, account for mercantile success in this line. For example, Hill and M'Gunnegle of St. Louis held the contract for Jefferson Barracks^{co} during most of the decade of the 1830's; the Aulls of Lexington, Mo., supplied the near-by Fort Leavenworth^{co} at times; and J. M. D. Burrows of Davenport, Iowa, profited from a contract for Fort Snelling^{co}. (See also Sutler.)

[J. M. D. Burrows, *Fifty Years in Iowa*; Lewis E. Atherton, James and Robert Aull—A Frontier Missouri Mercantile Firm, in *Missouri Historical Review*, XXX.]

LEWIS E. ATHERTON

Pot Likker and Corn Pone. A well-known culinary combination peculiar to the South is corn pone (something between hoe cake and corn bread) and pot likker (the juice of ham or fat-back cooked with turnip, poke or collard greens). In February, 1931, Gov. Huey P. Long, of Louisiana, asserted that corn pone should be "dunked"; the Atlanta (Ga.) *Constitution*, which claimed authority on "all matters pertaining to pot likker, corn pone, dumplings, fried collards, sweet 'tater biscuits, 'simmon beer, and 'possum," contended it should be crumbled in the pot likker. Most supported the "crumblers," but some politicians were careful to say that they liked it both ways.

[*New York Times*, Feb. 17-March 5, 1931.]

HARVEY L. CARTER

Potato Act. The Warren Act, designed to limit the production of potatoes and thereby raise prices, was made law in August, 1935, and went into effect Dec. 1. Under it, no producer was permitted to sell or trade any potatoes without procuring a permit from the Government. Growers were given maximum quotas, commensurate with their past sales; the potatoes must be marketed in bags, with stamps affixed, proving compliance with the act. No funds were appropriated by Congress with which to enforce the law. Due to public ridicule it was repealed by Congress on Feb. 4, 1936.

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Potatoes. The so-called Irish potato, a native of the Andes, was introduced into England in the 16th century. A ship is known to have carried potatoes from England to Bermuda in 1613, and in 1621 the governor of Bermuda sent to Gov. Francis Wyatt of Virginia two large chests filled with plants and fruits then unknown to the latter colony, among them potatoes, which were planted and grown in the settlements along the

James. In 1622 a Virginia barque brought from Bermuda to Virginia about 20,000 pounds of potatoes. It seems that their cultivation did not spread widely during that century, or, in fact, until a party of Scotch-Irish⁷⁰ immigrants brought potatoes with them to Rockingham County, N. H., in 1719 and thus firmly fixed the name "Irish" upon them. Some historians have asserted that this was the original introduction of potatoes to the American colonies; but Berthold Laufer (for the Field Museum of Natural History) quotes letters and documents to prove the century-earlier introduction into Virginia. A foreign traveler named Kalm found potatoes being grown at Albany in 1749. Thomas Jefferson wrote of cultivating potatoes, "both the long and the round." (Did he mean sweet and Irish?) Decades later the Navajo Indians of the Southwest were found to be planting a small, wild variety common in some parts of Mexico. The Irish potato came to be a daily item on the American dinner table, especially in the North, as an accompaniment for meats, and a major food crop in many states during the 19th century. Aroostook, the large, northernmost county of Maine, went into potato growing extensively, and in 1935 that county's potatoes produced half of the agricultural income of Maine. Aroostook housewives are said to have been the first or among the first to make starch for their white garments by soaking potato pulp in water and then drying it. Starch sheds began to appear along the streams, and eventually, Aroostook produced 90% of the nation's potato starch. The use of this starch declined greatly in the 20th century, however, and industrial alcohol appeared as a new means of saving the culls and the surplus.

Sweet potatoes (botanically, wholly unrelated to the Irish tuber), whose motherland is unknown, were being cultivated by the natives of the Americas before the arrival of Columbus, who, with the other members of his party, ate these potatoes and esteemed them highly. Because of the fact that they could be best grown in the South, and because they give an enormous yield (200 to 400 bushels per acre), they became a favorite vegetable in that section, while always remaining unknown to the table in large areas of the North. To the Southern Negro, sweet potatoes were an inevitable accompaniment of opossum meat, though balancing fresh pork and other meats almost equally well. To some poor families, at times in winter, they have been a major article of diet. Their cultivation spread to California, and gradually crept up the Atlantic coast as far as New Jersey. By 1930 some 50,000,000 bushels of sweet and more than 350,000,000 of Irish

potatoes were being grown annually in the United States.

[Berthold Laufer, *The American Plant Migration*, Part I, *The Potato*; William Stuart, *The Potato*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Potawatomi, THE, is an Indian tribe of the Algonquin family allied linguistically with the Ottawa and Chippewa⁷¹, with whom they originally formed one people. The various bands were gathered in the 1840's on one reservation in Kansas (see *Indian Removal*), where they divided in the late 1860's into two groups, the larger one moving to the present Oklahoma, the other remaining in Kansas.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*.]

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Potawatomie Massacre, THE, was the calling out and murdering by free-state⁷² men of five proslavery settlers near Dutch Henry's Crossing of Potawatomie Creek, Franklin County, Kans., on the night of May 24-25, 1856 (see *Border War*). The principal facts became known almost immediately. Many free-state men denounced the act, named six members of the John Brown family and two others, made affidavits on which warrants were issued, and one arrest was made (Townesley), but the case never went to trial. Some proslavery newspapers gave fairly accurate statements of facts, but were confused in attributing motives. The free-state press misrepresented both. Brown's first biographer, James Redpath, endorsed by the Brown family, denied (1860) that Brown was present or even had prior knowledge of it. Not until the statement of a participator, James Townesley, was published in December, 1879, did the Brown family and friends (with a few exceptions) admit the truth. From that date the Brown controversy centered upon motives and justification rather than denial, but with little success in establishing either.

The primary issue in the spring of 1856 was enforcement of the so-called "bogus laws" in various parts of the territory, threats were made against the courts and enforcement officers. The significant fact about the Potawatomie victims is that, except for the younger son of Doyle, they were members of the Franklin County grand jury or were associated otherwise with the session of court of April 21-22. These facts place the massacre in the category of political assassination with a view to preventing enforcement of law by resort to a reign of terror.

[O. G. Villard, *John Brown*; J. C. Malin, *The Hoogland Examination, Kansas Historical Quarterly*, May, 1938.]

JAMES C. MALIN

Potomac, Army of the (1861-65). The demoralization of the Union forces after the first Bull Run^m left Washington in an undefended state which might have proved disastrous had the Confederacy been able to take advantage of its opportunity. Immediately after congressional authorization for the acceptance of volunteers the Division of the Potomac was created (July 25, 1861), and two days later Gen George B McClellan was placed in command. The immediate purpose was to guard the approaches to the Potomac River, and thus to protect Washington. McClellan fell heir to "a collection of undisciplined, ill officered, and uninstructed men," already demoralized by defeat. On Aug 1 there were only about 37,000 infantry in the ranks, and the terms of many regiments were expiring. Four months later there were some 77,000 effectives available for active operations, aside from regiments on garrison and other duty. But the army was still growing.

McClellan's first job was to whip this heterogeneous mass of raw recruits into an effective fighting unit. The men were from all walks of life and every part of the country. Some were volunteers from foreign nations and many could not speak English. McClellan was not allowed to expand the regulars or break them up to head volunteers, and many of the political generals at his disposal were worse than useless. Also, he was hampered by the officious meddling and machinations of political leaders, while his own temperament was not such as to smooth out such difficulties. Nevertheless, in a very few months he evolved the best army the United States had had to that time, and so inspired it with a spirit of loyalty and feeling of destiny that all the interference from Washington during the remainder of the war could not permanently harm its morale.

Such an army was not allowed to exhibit its true worth until the war was half over. If McClellan overestimated the enemy in the Peninsular Campaign^m, it must be remembered that he was not allowed control of the intelligence service. Also, Washington officialdom far outdid him in that respect by withholding McDowell's 40,000 to guard against a possible attack on Washington by a third as many men under Stonewall Jackson (see Jackson's Valley Campaign). When the Seven Days Battles^m resulted in the army reaching the James, and in a better position to advance on Richmond than was to be achieved for two more years, McClellan was demoted beneath the incompetent Pope and the pick of the army was removed to join the latter at Acquia Creek. In caution McClellan was exceeded by

Thomas, in blunders by Grant, in egotism and insubordination by Stanton. His tardiness in pursuit after Antietam^m was at least as excusable as that of Meade after Gettysburg^m. But by July, 1863, Washington officialdom had learned to give a general a chance while he was winning. In 1864 and 1865, with Meade still in command but a Grant rather than a Halleck giving the superior orders, the Army of the Potomac was allowed to complete the work which McClellan had outlined and begun in 1862.

[J. G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction*.]

FRED A. SHANNON

Potomac Company, THE (original spelling Patowmack), was organized in 1785 with the idea that it would eventually achieve a waterway connection between the Potomac and Ohio rivers. George Washington was one of the incorporators and was elected president. Work was begun that summer on a short canal with locks around the Great Falls of the Potomac, near the present site of Washington—the first corporate improvement of navigation for public use in America. This canal was not completed until 1802. By 1808 there were four more short canals between Washington and a point above Harpers Ferry, the longest one 3814 yards in length. These were of great assistance to boatmen and raftsmen in bringing their products down to tidewater; but the project was not a paying one, and, when the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company^m was organized, the Potomac Company willingly surrendered its charter and rights to the new corporation in 1828.

[Alvin F. Harlow, *Old Towpaths*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Potomac River drains the western slopes of the central Allegheny Mountains into the Chesapeake Bay. Two main streams, the North Branch and the South Branch and several minor streams unite to form the upper Potomac. A fresh-water river for about 300 miles, the Potomac below Washington, D. C., is a tidal estuary 125 miles in length and from two to eight miles wide.

Spaniards probably reached the Potomac estuary before 1570. Capt. John Smith visited, described and mapped it in 1608. Capt. Samuel Argall and others sailed its waters in the next decade. In the following decade Virginia traders frequented its waters and shores. Probably agents of George Calvert before 1632 explored the upper Potomac. After the founding of Maryland^m in 1634, the Potomac was the early passageway of the colony. In following decades its southern shores were gradually settled by Virginians. But

owing to the falls above Washington, D. C. and at Harpers Ferry the upper Potomac was long unimportant. In the second quarter of the 18th century, however, Germans and Scotch-Irish crossed it into the Shenandoah Valley, and about 1740 Thomas Cresap, militant Marylander, settled at Old Town, fourteen miles below the mouth of Wills Creek. Slowly the Potomac Valley became a pathway to the Ohio Valley⁷⁹, utilized by the Ohio Company of Virginia⁸⁰, by Washington and by Braddock⁸¹. Over this route traveled the first settlers to the Monongahela country. Its utilization was the basis of later enterprises, such as the Potomac Company of 1785, the Cumberland Road of 1807, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company of 1828, and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad of 1827⁸².

[Mrs. Corra Bacon Foster, *Early Chapters in the Development of the Potomac Route to the West*, Paul Wiltstach, *Potomac Landings*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Pottery, in what is now the United States, was made by the so-called Moundbuilders of the Mississippi Valley and by the Indians (*see Pottery, Indian*). The crude articles produced along the Atlantic coast were much inferior to the highly artistic creations of the Pueblo⁸³ tribes of the Southwest. Among the colonists, the Virginians first practised the potter's art, but during the 17th century there were beginnings elsewhere, as in New York and New Jersey. The 18th century saw the production of many coarse pottery household articles, and, especially in Pennsylvania, some decorative pieces; pewter and wood-ware, however, predominated until 1800. By 1790 some Oriental pottery and by 1815 much English pottery was imported. Around 1800, various articles were being produced at Stonington and Norwalk, Conn., and, beginning about 1825, some produced by a plant in Jersey City were of a very ornate type. Elsewhere potteries, especially one at Bennington, Vt., attained noteworthy results. Large scale commercial developments came chiefly after 1850. Trenton, N. J., became an important center for numerous establishments producing all grades of pottery; and in Ohio available clays and cheap natural gas made East Liverpool the pottery capital of the country. Ornamental products at moderate prices began to be produced by Weller's and other firms in the vicinity of Zanesville. Especially artistic have been the beautiful products of the Rockwood pottery, established at Cincinnati in 1880; of the Grueby works in Boston; and of Newcombe College, New Orleans.

[Edwin A. Barber, *The Pottery and Porcelain of the United States*; Wilber Stout, *History of the Clay Indus-*

try in Ohio, in Geological Survey of Ohio, Fourth Series, Bulletin 26.]

FRANCIS PHELPS WEISENBURGER

Pottery, Indian, takes a prominent place in the history of aboriginal culture, partly because of its indestructibility, but chiefly because it serves as an index to time sequence in pre-Columbian history. Pre-Columbian pottery is found practically everywhere in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains. Washington, Oregon, northern California and parts of Idaho return no pottery. The outstanding prehistoric developments in pottery were in New Mexico and Arizona, the flood plain of the Mississippi River between St. Louis and New Orleans, and in Alabama and Georgia. In New England, New York, Kentucky and generally west of the Mississippi, archaeologists find the remains of cultures using pottery overlaying no-pottery cultures. This has been interpreted as giving a prehistoric horizon, as between the early hunting cultures and the later more sedentary modes of life. Pottery forms and styles vary from century to century, which in turn mark time sequence horizons; thus in New Mexico and Arizona at least six successive prehistoric culture periods are indicated by changes in pottery styles. In parts of the Mississippi Valley four such horizons are known.

Indian pottery was made by hand, the wheel being unknown. Decorations were by incised and stamped designs, in the east, while in the west, painted designs prevailed. Practically all pre-Columbian pottery was unglazed.

[Clark Wissler, *The American Indian*.]

CLARK WISSLER

Poultry Case. *See* Schechter v. U. S.

Poverty. *See* Pauperism and Poverty.

Powder. Little powder was manufactured in the thirteen colonies prior to the American Revolution. The principal supply of the colonists in 1775 was left over from the supplies of the French and Indian War. So limited were the facilities for its manufacture in the colonies that had it not been for the importation of 478,250 lbs. of saltpetre and 1,454,210 lbs. of black powder in the years from 1775-77, the struggle for independence might have been lost. Less than 10% of the powder used by the revolutionary armies up to 1778 was produced in the colonies.

The production of powder on a large scale in the United States began with Elèuthère Irénée du Pont⁸⁴, who, on the encouragement of Jefferson, bought equipment in France and set up a powder mill in 1801 near Wilmington, Del. Powder was successfully produced in 1804, and this company continued to grow until it virtually

controlled the production of explosives in the United States. It supplied the Government with 150,000 lbs. of black powder during the Barbary Wars, 750,000 lbs. during the War of 1812, nearly 4,000,000 lbs. during the Civil War, and 2,000,000 lbs. of brown prismatic powder during the Spanish-American War.

In 1857 Lamont du Pont patented the use of nitrate of soda in the manufacture of blasting powder for industrial use. The mining industry in the United States ordinarily consumes 80% of the "B" powder manufactured in the United States. In 1872 the three largest powder producing agencies in the country, Laflin & Rand, du Pont and Hazard, combined to form The Gunpowder Trade Association which dominated this field. The invention of dynamite and smokeless powder complicated the manufacturing problem, but American firms soon adapted their plants for the manufacture of these products.

The United States Circuit Court in the District of Delaware in 1911 found the du Pont corporation guilty of violating the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Law⁷, and ordered a distribution of its assets among three companies. These three firms produced 90% of the explosives manufactured in the United States. The World War found the explosive industry in the United States undergoing a vast expansion. War orders from the Allied governments increased the daily output of smokeless powder in the United States from 50,000 lbs. in 1914 to 1,250,000 lbs. in 1917. In order to make the United States independent of outside imports of nitrate of soda, plants were built to produce nitrogen by the fixation process. The most famous of these plants was at Muscle Shoals, Ala. Since the war the chemical explosives industry has been converted to the production of industrial chemicals on a large scale. (See also Nitrates.)

[A. P. Van Gelder and H. Schlatter, *History of the Explosive Industry in America.*]

H. A. DLWEED

Powder River Campaign (July to October, 1865). To protect the frontier (see Sand Creek Massacre), impress the Indians and to open the Bozeman Trail⁸, Gen. P. E. Connor led an expedition from Colorado into the heart of the Sioux country in central Wyoming. (See also Dakotas, Expeditions of Gen. Sibley and Gen. Sully in.) The troops concentrated at Fort Connor⁹. Mismanagement and cruel and unmerciful treatment of the Indians provoked much criticism and caused recall of the troops. The expedition failed and the Indians were embittered. In spite of peace efforts (see Indian Commission) hostilities were soon resumed (see Red Cloud War).

Powers, Separation of

[E. A. Brininstool and G. R. Hebard, *The Bozeman Trail.*]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Powell's (John W.) Explorations of the Colorado River of the west were two in number. The first and more important, in 1869, was the pioneer passage by a white man of the entire length of this river with its precipitous canyons (see Grand Canyon of the Colorado) and long series of treacherous rapids and waterfalls. Entering the river where the Union Pacific Railroad¹⁰ crosses Green River in May, 1869, the company of eight, in four boats, did not emerge until Aug. 29, after a journey of 900 miles. So dangerous were the rapids that three of the party deserted before the end of the journey. Powell reported the expedition to Congress and that body appropriated additional funds for the exploration of adjacent streams and territories, which Powell undertook and again descended the river in 1871, 1874 and 1875. As a result of his success Powell was named director of the Survey of the Rocky Mountain region in 1877, but in 1879 all local surveys were merged in the U. S. Geological Survey¹¹ of which Powell became chief in 1881. The geological value of Powell's descent of the Colorado was slight but the hazard of the adventure and his picturesque reports concerning it did much to establish the popularity of scientific expeditions and to secure government support for them. His first report was revised and enlarged in 1895 under the title *Canyons of the Colorado*.

[F. S. Dellenbaugh, *Canyon Voyage*; R. B. Stanton, *Colorado River Controversies.*]

CARL L. CANNON

Powell's Valley is the most westerly of the long narrow valleys in southwestern Virginia and northeastern Tennessee. It leads directly to Cumberland Gap¹². In 1750 Dr. Thomas Walker explored it (see Loyal Land Company), and one of his party, Ambrose Powell, cut his name on a tree, hence the name. The first cabin in the valley was built in 1768 by Joseph Martin. There Daniel Boone's party was turned back, in 1773, from Kentucky after the Indians had killed his son and others. Through Powell's Valley passed the land route to Kentucky and the Wilderness Road¹³. It was traversed by thousands of caravans.

[R. G. Thwaites and L. P. Kellogg, *Dunmore's War.*]

LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG

Powers, Separation of. One of the fundamental American constitutional principles is the doctrine of separation of powers under which governmental powers are vested in three different

branches of government: the legislative, the executive and the judicial.

While the idea of separation of powers may be traced back to such ancient writers as Aristotle and Cicero, it was the Frenchman, Montesquieu, who first formulated it as a doctrine for safeguarding liberty. In his famous work, *The Spirit of Laws* (1748), Montesquieu warned that there could be no liberty if the legislative, executive and judicial powers, or any two of them, were exercised by one person or by one group of persons. A similar idea was expressed by Blackstone in his famous *Commentaries*.

The writings of these two were well known to leading Americans of the late colonial and early national periods. This is well demonstrated by the allusions to the principle of separation of powers in important constitutional documents of the period.

In the tenth resolve of the Declaration of Rights^o adopted by the First Continental Congress in 1774, the importance of the principle was clearly recognized. When the original state constitutions^o were drafted during the period of the Revolution^o, considerable attention was given to the application of the principle. The Virginia constitution emphatically declared that the powers of government should "be separate and distinct." The Massachusetts constitution of 1780 also had a definite statement requiring the separation of powers in the government of the commonwealth "to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men."

At the time of the framing of the Federal Constitution in 1787 (see Convention of 1787), the doctrine of separation of powers was accepted without question by the national leaders. James Madison, George Washington and Gouverneur Morris, to mention only a few of the prominent framers, subscribed to the principle. Yet it was not written directly into the Constitution. Rather, it was incorporated in the national document through the "distributing clauses" as the opening statements of the first three articles of the Constitution are called.

The framers of the fundamental law were well aware that it would be impossible to operate the three branches of the Federal Government as though they were in airtight compartments, with the functions of each so defined as to prevent any overlapping. This is demonstrated by the fact that they also gave application in the document to what is known as the principle of checks and balances^o.

Through the operation of the two principles, the founding fathers believed each branch of the Government could be kept within bounds.

At least, they hoped to create a condition which would prevent any branch from exercising, in the words of James Madison, "directly or indirectly, an overruling influence over the others, in the administration of their respective powers."

A study of the constitutional history of the period since the Constitution was put into operation in 1789 reveals that this hope has not been fully realized. At no time has any one branch succeeded in securing or even attempted to secure for itself all the powers of government though it is obvious that, at various times, one branch or another has been far more influential than either of the others. Thus, in the early years of the constitutional period, Congress^o was the dominant branch. Then, for a time, the judiciary^o, under the leadership of Chief Justice John Marshall, exerted what many believed to be an undue influence. But chiefly, the executive^o branch has tended to dominate the Government. This has been notably true under such Presidents as Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[*The Federalist*; S. P. Orth and R. E. Cushman, *American National Government*.] ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Powhatan Incident (April, 1861). Relief expeditions were ordered sent to Forts Sumter and Pickens^o. Secretary of State Seward, to maintain his supremacy in Lincoln's Cabinet, secretly arranged to send the *Powhatan* to Fort Pickens and on April 1 secured Lincoln's signature to the necessary order; on April 5 Secretary of the Navy Welles ordered the *Powhatan* to join the Sumter expedition. As a consequence of the ensuing controversy, Seward, over his own signature, directed transfer of the *Powhatan* to the Sumter expedition, but the ship was already on its way to Fort Pickens when the order was received. Porter, its commander, declined to obey Seward's order stating that the presidential order took precedence. The Pickens expedition was successful; the naval relief of Fort Sumter failed.

[A. Howard Meneely, *The War Department, 1861*; M. C. Meigs and the Civil War, in *American Historical Review*, Vol. XXVI.] THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Pownall, Fort, was named after Gov. Thomas Pownall of Massachusetts Bay, who was largely responsible for its erection in 1759. This English fort, situated on the Penobscot River near what is now Fort Point, was one of the most defensible strongholds occupied by the English during the French and Indian War^o.

[W. D. Williamson, *The History of Maine*.]

ELIZABETH RING

Powwow appears in colonial literature of the 17th century both as a noun and as a verb, apparently from an Algonkin[™] word meaning priest, magician, medicine man, etc. From 1650 on, any gathering of Indians for a feast, conference or ceremony, likewise the ceremonies of a doctor over a patient, were designated as powwows. Among the tribes of Massachusetts *pauwau* meant a priest, medicine man, or one who derived his power from dreams, hence, the application of the term to all gatherings of Indians in which singing, dancing and rituals were the order of the day. However, the implication of the term is that a medicine man worked his magic in and through these gatherings.

[Clark Wissler, *The American Indian*.]

CLARK WISSLER

Prairie Dogs are burrowing rodents which formerly infested the plains in immense numbers from Texas to Canada and the western slope of the Rocky Mountains. Since they lived underground in large colonies, threw up craters of earth at the surface of their burrows (excluding rain) and lived on grass, they destroyed vast areas of good grazing land. The cattlemen considered them pests for this reason and also because horses broke their legs by stepping in their holes. Prairie dogs do not require any drinking water and do not, as commonly believed, associate on friendly terms with rattlesnakes and owls. Both of the latter are found in prairie dog colonies but live in abandoned burrows. They are natural enemies. One prairie dog colony in Trego County, Kans., extended one hundred miles with a breadth of a half to five miles. Many prairie dogs are still to be found but for economic reasons ways have been found to keep them in check.

[W. T. Hornaday, *American Natural History*.]

CARL L. GANNON

Prairie du Chien was a French settlement commanding the western end of the Fox-Wisconsin waterway[™] from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi. The site was first visited in 1673 by Joliet[™] and Marquette. About 1683 a French officer built at this site Fort St. Nicolas, which was maintained until 1689 or later. It was not until the 18th century that the place acquired its present name from a Fox Indian chief named LeChien, who had a large village on this prairie. The settlement of French traders and *voyageurs*[™] began about the middle of this century. Jean Marie Cardinal from the Illinois is known to have been there by 1754. After the cession in 1763 of all this region to the British (*see* Paris, Treaty of, 1763), their traders mingled with the former French, and during the expansion of the

fur trade Prairie du Chien became an important mart. Jonathan Carver[™], who visited here in 1766 and 1767, mentions the great concourse of traders, which met at this place each spring, and the rivalry with the British of the Spanish traders from St. Louis and New Orleans.

During the American Revolution a small fort was built by the British at Prairie du Chien, from which a raid was undertaken against the Spanish and Americans at St. Louis and Cahokia[™]. This fort was burned to prevent it from falling into the hands of American and Spanish who made a retaliatory raid.

In 1781 three French-Canadian settlers of Prairie du Chien purchased the site from the Indians, and the village began to grow. By the end of the century it contained about 100 houses and as many families, mostly of French-Canadian origin. Meanwhile, notwithstanding the cession of this region to the United States in 1783 (*see* Definitive Treaty of Peace), the British maintained a firm hold on the fur trade[™] of the upper Mississippi, and few Americans entered the region. In 1803 some American commissions were granted the British fur traders, and in 1805 Lt. Pike[™] was sent up the Mississippi to assert the authority of the United States, but without much success.

On the outbreak of the War of 1812 all Americans were driven from the region, and the British enrolled the Indians in their forces. In 1814 Gen. William Clark came up the river from St. Louis and built Fort Shelby at Prairie du Chien, raising the first American flag in what is now Wisconsin. The British sent an expedition from Mackinac[™] to dislodge the Americans. This clash was the only one between civilized opponents on Wisconsin soil. The Americans were dispossessed, Fort Shelby became Fort McKay.

After the Treaty of Ghent[™] (1814) Prairie du Chien was occupied permanently by the Americans. Fort Crawford[™] was built in 1816 and American traders and settlers flocked thither. In 1817 the first priest came up the river and about the same time the first school was begun. The chief traders for the American Fur Company[™] were Joseph Rolette and H. L. Dousman.

Prairie du Chien became a steamboat port in the middle 19th century, the first steamboat going up the river in 1823, and in 1857 the railroad from Milwaukee entered the city.

[P. L. Scanland, *Prairie du Chien: French, British, American*; L. P. Kellogg, *British Régime in Wisconsin and the Northwest*.]

LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG

Prairie du Chien, Indian Treaty at (1825). The two great tribes of Chippewa and Sioux[™]

had been enemies for over a century, and had drawn neighboring tribes into the feud. In 1824 a deputation to Washington requested the Federal Government to set up boundaries between the tribal lands. The treaty of 1825 was called for that purpose. Gen. William Clark of St. Louis and Gov. Lewis Cass of Detroit were the American commissioners. The tribal chiefs assembled to the number of over 1000: a magnificent spectacle of the Indian in his native finery and physical strength, before he had been debauched by white contact. The Philadelphia artist, J. O. Lewis, was present, and painted many chiefs from life. A bower was built outside Fort Crawford^{tr}, the garrison of which preserved order.

This treaty, unlike others made with the Indian, contained no cession of land. Boundaries were established, which the several tribes agreed to respect. The parties to the treaty were Sioux, Chippewa, Sauk and Foxes, Potawatomi, Winnebago^{tr} and Iowa.

[P. L. Scanlan, *Prairie du Chien*; C. J. Kappler, ed., *Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties.*]

LOUISE PHELPS KELLOGG

Prairie Fires. In the autumn after the luxuriant grass had been frosted, a stroke of lightning, a match carelessly dropped, sparks from a locomotive, or the burning wads from the discharge of a shot gun were enough to start a blazing, leaping consuming force which moved across the prairie with the speed of the wind, destroying crops, hay, barns, houses, stock and even taking the lives of people. The sky was pierced with spires of flame and a devouring inferno raced across the plain. Domestic and wild animals dashed madly ahead of the flame seeking safety. Sometimes entire settlements were devastated. The grand and startling spectacle was one of the greatest terrors to the settlers. So intense was the heat from a prairie fire in South Dakota in 1871 that the wall of fire leaped across the Vermilion and James rivers as if attracted by a powerful magnet. The settlers in Wells County, N. Dak., in the 1880's observed that prairie fires starting far to the north would burn six weeks or more. Each day the smoke grew more dense until finally the sun would be obscured for days. At night the reflection of fire on the clouds could be seen drawing nearer and nearer. At times, towns were destroyed and communities were broken.

Very little could be accomplished fighting a head fire, but side fires could be put out. It was the unwritten although binding law that at the first word of warning every able-bodied man was to appear with fire fighting equipment to

help extinguish the blaze. A man who slept while neighbors fought fire was despised by the community. Buckets of water and wet sacks were often used to beat out the fire. Sometimes on the range a cow was killed, the body split in half and cowboys with ropes dragged each half of the carcass over the side fires, putting them out as fast as the men could ride.

Every one venturing on the prairie carried matches for personal safety. If caught by a prairie fire, he burned a spot on which to stand. This idea of fighting fire by burning another area in the path of the fire was known as back firing. Settlers protected their farms and ranges by plowing two sets of furrows around their property and burning off a wide strip between the two plowed areas. When the prairies were settled and the land broken, this most dreaded danger disappeared.

[Everett Dick, *The Sod House Frontier.*]

EVERETT DICK

Prairie Grove, Ark., Battle at, also known as battle of Fayetteville or battle of Illinois Creek (Dec. 7, 1862). After the defeat at Corinth^{tr}, Pemberton (C) ordered Holmes to send Hindman's Arkansas troops to Vicksburg^{tr}. Resentful, Hindman planned to attack Blunt (U.) before leaving the state. Learning that Herron was coming up to re-enforce Blunt at Prairie Grove, Hindman decided to destroy Herron first, then engage Blunt. Marmaduke's (C.) cavalry was successful against Herron but, when Hindman advanced his infantry, instead of attacking he went into defensive position. This allowed Blunt to join Herron and, with superior numbers, they forced Hindman to retreat in defeat to Van Buren.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. III.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Prairie Schooner, THE, was a large wagon originally made with the sides of the box sloping outward. Six or seven arching wooden bows supported a canvas cover which, seen in the distance, so resembled a ship at sea as to suggest the name. The descendant of the old Conestoga wagon^{tr} in which Pittsburgh "stogies" were early transported to Philadelphia, the prairie schooner was also the ancestor of the modern truck and trailer. First brought into common use in the Santa Fé trade soon after 1821, it was later used by the Mormons, California gold seekers, emigrants to Oregon, freighters operating on the Great Plains, and, in a modified form, by settlers seeking homesteads on the western prairies^{tr}. Among the first used in the West were the "Murphy wagons" with iron axles made in St. Louis. Other types were made in Indianapolis, Chicago

and Kenosha. The prairie schooner was usually drawn by three to six yoke of oxen or four to six mules. Its importance in the settlement and development of the Great West was enormous. It was not only the chief means for the transportation of goods, but it also provided a home for the family of the pioneer emigrant as he journeyed west in search of land.

[William Francis Hooker, *The Prairie Schooner*; Edward Everett Dale, *The Prairie Schooner and Other Poems*.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Prairies, THE, are a geographical region whose eastern border is an irregular line crossing Minnesota and Wisconsin in a southeasterly direction and extending into western Indiana, thence southwest through Illinois, Missouri, Oklahoma and Texas, and whose western boundary merges into the Great Plains. It is a vast area of grasslands as differentiated from the forest lands on the east. When the Americans first discovered this region it caused some alarm since it was thought the land was too infertile to produce trees. One result of the feeling that the valuable farming land was about all occupied was that the frontiersmen, with an eye on the Canadian forests, clamored loudly for war against Great Britain in 1812 (see War Hawks). So strongly did the idea persist that prairie land was poor soil that the timberland was almost always settled first. For this reason the rough, rocky portions of Missouri were settled before the rich prairies of the northeast. The prairie land had the advantage of being much easier to bring under cultivation. In a very few years a whole quarter section was bearing crops whereas in forested areas a decade often found the settler with only a patch of ground, comparatively, cleared. The objection to the prairie as a place for pioneering was the lack of timber for fuel and fencing.

[Ellen Semple, *American History and Its Geographic Conditions*.]

EVERETT DICK

Praying Indians, English converts to Christianity, were most numerous in New England, where 1100 of them were reported in 1674, and fourteen native towns were supervised by John Eliot, "Apostle to the Indians," and Daniel Gookin, Puritan magistrate. Plymouth missions were served by John Cotton, Jr., Richard Bourne and others; Indians on neighboring islands were converted by Thomas Mayhew, Jr., and his father (proprietor of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket) aided by Hiacoomes and other natives in overcoming opposition by chieftains and medicine men. Missionary society funds from London were distributed through the commissioners of the New England Confederation. But to many

English colonists Indians seemed hopelessly unregenerate, especially after King Philip's War⁷ when, despite the Praying Indians' loyalty, missions lost much support. Interest revived by the Great Awakening⁷ is illustrated in work for Indians by Jonathan Edwards and Eleazar Wheelock. Virginia's early plans for Christian education of Indian youths did not survive the 1622 massacre (see Great Massacre, The). Maryland's Catholic missions were not extensive, nor the Brainerds' work in the middle colonies permanent. In the mid-18th century Christian Indians (Moravian converts) on Pennsylvania's frontier were harassed by suspicious whites (see Gnadenhutten), but in New York Sir William Johnson professed zeal for Anglican missions and the noted Brant was among the converts (see Indian Missions).

[L. C. M. Hare, *Thomas Mayhew, Patriarch to the Indians*; H. L. Osgood, *The American Colonies*.]

LOUISE B. DUNBAR

Pre-emption. Compact orderly settlement in groups or colonies and a continuous source of income for the Federal Treasury were the principal motives for the land policies adopted in the early years of our national history. To this end settlement was restricted to surveyed areas and the surveys were not made far in advance of demand (see Public Lands, Survey of). Inevitably, however, the lack of restraint and social control on the frontier broke down these policies. Settlers pushed farther into the unsurveyed territory, even into the Indian country⁷, and, if forcibly removed, would promptly return and reconstruct their homes when the troops had withdrawn. As all lands when first brought on the market were put up at auction and sold to the highest bidder, the threat of the forthcoming government sale hung over the squatters⁷ like the sword of Damocles (see Public Land Sales). Their improvements might give value to their land but they did not provide the necessary cash, always scarce on the frontier, to buy the land at the auction sale and there was always the danger that speculators might purchase their claims. Furthermore, in the absence of land laws, squatters had difficulty in protecting their improvements against claim jumpers⁷ before the day of sale arrived.

The squatters early besought Congress to grant them the right of pre-empting their claims in advance of the land sale so they would not be obliged to bid for them against speculators. Congress, increasingly responsive to demands of the West, granted pre-emption rights to sixteen special groups before 1830, and between 1830 and 1840 gave pre-emption rights on five occasions to all squatters then residing upon the surveyed

lands. In 1841 the general pre-emption law was passed which gave the pre-emption right to all squatters then located or who in the future should take up locations upon the surveyed public lands. This act, although a victory for the West, by no means satisfied the settlers on the frontier. It neither applied to Indian reservations⁷⁰ nor to unsurveyed lands; it did not provide for free grants to actual settlers, and it retained the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre.

Squatters on surveyed lands before and on unsurveyed lands after 1841 were not sure of obtaining pre-emption rights. To provide mutual protection in the absence of such rights they organized claim associations⁷¹. But such associations were powerless to aid, nor did the pre-emption law protect the penniless settler who was threatened with the loss of his claim if he could not raise the \$200 necessary to buy it before the government auction.

The pre-emption law remained in effect until 1891, but in the later years it was subject to serious abuses. In areas where only limited entries of public lands could be made, predatory interests found it possible to acquire large tracts by employing "floaters" to pre-empt land for them. False swearing, bribery of the land officers, laxity of supervision and general western approval of such practices made evasion of the law easy. Finally, in 1891, when sentiment against the monopolization of the public lands by corrupt groups had become sufficiently aroused, the land system was given a thorough overhauling and the pre-emption law was repealed. For thirty years it had outlived its usefulness. (See also Homestead Movement.)

[R. M. Robbins, Pre-emption—A Frontier Triumph, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XVIII; B. H. Hibbard, *History of the Public Land Policies*.]

PAUL WALLACE GATES

Preferential Voting is a method of voting under which the voter expresses a first choice, second choice and sometimes third and further choices among the candidates nominated. It is frequently used as a substitute for primary elections⁷², which it makes unnecessary. It is one feature of the Hare system of proportional representation⁷³ and is also used in several different forms for majority elections of single officials.

[C. G. Hoag and G. H. Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation*.]

GEORGE H. HALLETT, JR.

"Preparedness" (1914-17). It was probably inevitable that the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 should be followed by a movement in the United States toward strengthening the country's military and naval forces. The movement

was under way before the war was more than a few months old, and it gathered momentum steadily as it became clear that the belligerents were interfering more and more with American interests and the danger of American involvement in the struggle grew.

An early landmark was the publication of Theodore Roosevelt's *America and the World War* in January, 1915. From this time forward Roosevelt was much in the public eye as an advocate of larger forces; his *Fear God and Take Your Own Part* (1916) was another literary contribution to the cause. Associated with him was Gen. Leonard Wood. Both men favored some form of universal military service. The most definite result of Wood's efforts was the officers' training camp for business and professional men, conducted at Plattsburg⁷⁴, N. Y., in the summer of 1915 and again the following year. This enterprise, though on a small scale compared with the emergency that was coming, attracted much attention and had considerable effect on public opinion. During 1915, moreover, two organizations came into being which thereafter played a great part in the campaign: the National Security League and the League to Enforce Peace. Both included in their membership many national figures, and though they approached the question from different viewpoints both were influential in advancing the cause of preparedness. Such books as F. L. Huidekoper's *The Military Unpreparedness of the United States* and Hudson Maxim's *Defenseless America* (both 1915) doubtless had some further effect.

In the beginning the national administration was decidedly cool to the agitation, and President Wilson received much abuse from leaders of the movement, especially Roosevelt. As time passed, however, the President appears to have decided that preparedness was a logical corollary to his policy of attempting to compel the combatants to respect American rights. The turning point seems to have been the first German submarine campaign, beginning February, 1915, and from this time Wilson himself became more and more an advocate of larger armaments. In December, 1915, the administration presented to Congress a comprehensive scheme of national defense which (after much discussion and numerous alterations) was enacted into law in the National Defense Act⁷⁵ of June 3 and the naval appropriation act of Aug. 29, 1916, which provided for an unprecedented increase in the country's forces (see Defense, National; Army, United States; Navy, United States). War with Germany came a few months later, before the army reorganization was more than begun; while the new naval

program proved unsuited for intervention on the side of the Allies, a task which demanded innumerable small craft for ant submarine work, rather than the heavy ships of the 1916 act. The material achievement of the agitation was small in comparison with the tremendous national effort of 1917-18, but it was not without value; perhaps, however, the campaign's most useful work had been in preparing the nation psychologically for the ordeal that lay ahead, and in particular for the imposition of compulsory service.

[Hermann Hagedorn, *Leonard Wood*; Walter Millis, *Road to War*, Henry F. Pringle, *Theodore Roosevelt*; Mark Sullivan, *Our Times*, Vol. V.]

C. P. STACEY

Presbyterians, THE, in the United States, owe their origin in large measure to the 18th-century Scotch-Irish^m immigration. Though there was some Presbyterian influence in New England Puritanism^m, this was relatively slight.

The father of American Presbyterianism was Francis Makemie (1658-1708), a Scotch-Irish licentiate who came to the eastern shore of Maryland in 1683 where he began preaching in several Scotch-Irish communities, and in 1684 formed the Snow Hill church. His appeal for assistance to the Presbyterian Union of London brought additional helpers, and in 1706 he took the leadership in forming the Philadelphia Presbytery. As Scotch-Irish immigration increased the number of congregations grew, particularly following the great middle colony revival. In 1716 the Synod of Philadelphia was formed, of four presbyteries and thirty ministers. The early colonial ministerial supply came partly from New England—Jonathan Dickinson and Aaron Burr, Sr., both graduates of Yale College, are notable examples. After the founding of the College of New Jersey (*see* Princeton University) a majority of the ministerial supply came from that source. With the adoption by Connecticut of the Saybrook Platform^m (1708) Connecticut Congregationalism^m tended more and more toward Presbyterianism, a fact of large importance to both denominations. The passage by the Synod in 1729 of the Adopting Act, requiring all ministers to subscribe to the Westminster Confession^m, was an influential factor in keeping American Presbyterianism conservative.

Though the colonial revival^m caused a temporary division (1745-58) into Old Side and New Side bodies, Presbyterianism grew rapidly and by the beginning of the Revolution ranked only second to Congregationalism as the most numerous religious body in the colonies. Their almost unanimous support of the patriot cause added to

Presidency Succession

their prestige, while the formation of a national organization in 1788 with a general assembly as the lawmaking body placed them in a particularly favorable position for national expansion.

The Presbyterians proved to be one of the most influential of the frontier churches, though their rigidity of doctrine and polity together with their relatively high educational standards for their ministry proved a handicap in competition with the Baptists and Methodists^m. They were, however, the great college founders, and up to the Civil War exercised the largest cultural influence in the West.

The Plan of Union of 1801^m, providing for co-operation between Presbyterians and Congregationalists on the frontier, at first seemed to work in favor of Presbyterians, and a large number of Congregational churches became Presbyterian. This very fact, however, was to be the main cause of controversy and eventual schism, and in 1837-38 the main body of American Presbyterians were divided into Old School and New School bodies. The Civil War further divided these bodies into northern and southern divisions, a division which still persists. In 1937 the northern church had 1,909,487 members, and the southern body had 477,468. The United Presbyterian church, formed (1858) by the union of two covenanter groups, the Associate Reformed and the Associate, ranks third in membership with 179,338. The Cumberland Presbyterians^m were fourth in size with 70,274.

[C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism, Its Origin and Early History*; E. H. Gillett, *History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, W. W. Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier: The Presbyterians*; L. G. Vander Velde, *The Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union, 1861-1869*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Presidency, Succession to. Article II of the Constitution states that, if the Presidency is vacated or the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, "the same shall devolve on the Vice-President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice-President." Under this authority Congress, in 1792, enacted a law which provided that those in order of succession, after the Vice-President, should be the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House. This provision was replaced in 1886 by the Presidential Succession Act which specified that, after the Vice-President, the succession should pass to the heads of the executive departments in the order of the establishment of their offices. By the Twentieth Amendment^m, it was further provided that, if the President-elect died or failed to qualify be-

fore the inauguration date, the Vice-President-elect should act as President. If both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect failed to qualify, Congress was empowered to declare "who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected."

[Frederic A. Ogg and P. Orman Ray, *Introduction to American Government*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

President, THE. The prototype of this officer was the Governor, the chief executive of crown authority in the thirteen colonies. Frequent clashes with the popular assemblies so discredited them that the earliest state constitutions generally left the governors "mere cyphers." In Massachusetts and New York, however, they were endowed with adequate authority and here the framers of the Constitution found their models when they created the office of President (C. C. Thach, *The Creation of the Presidency*, p. 27).

No distinct executive was required in the governments of the Continental Congress and the Articles of Confederation⁹⁹ since they exercised no powers over private persons. But when the Convention of 1787⁹⁹ vested such powers in the central government it was compelled to create a positive executive authority. The solution of this, the Convention's most perplexing structural problem, found expression in the clause: "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States." A generation exceedingly jealous of executive power was reconciled to the perilous potentialities of this sweeping clause only by the universal understanding that Washington would be the first President.

The brilliant leadership of Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, acting in conscious imitation of an English prime minister, tended to make Washington a titular chief. Consequently the first grist of the legislative mill became Hamilton's program, not the President's. But this setup was short-lived, and a decade later President Jefferson (1801-9) established the first positive presidential leadership through personal followers planted in every legislative and executive key-position. This too proved transient and during the administrations of Madison (1809-17) and Monroe (1817-25) Congress⁹⁹, through the caucus⁹⁹, determined the choice of Presidents. Under the circumstances of this subordination the significance of the office declined by the early 1820's to the lowest point in American history.

The modern pattern of the Presidency dates from the administration of Andrew Jackson (1829-37). The choice of the masses, then only recently enfranchised, he assumed to act as a "tribune of the people" (see Jacksonian Democ-

racy). Though sharply challenged on this matter by his Whig⁹⁹ opponents the doctrine nevertheless took firm root. President Tyler (1841-45) stubbornly maintained it in the face of a Congress determined once more to subordinate the Presidency. Presidents ever since have been reasserting the Jacksonian doctrine, Cleveland even declaring that "The Presidency is peculiarly the people's office." By the end of the generation that preceded the Civil War the significance of the office had grown so great that the election in 1860 of Lincoln, a President unacceptable to the cotton planting interests, provoked the secession movement⁹⁹.

In Lincoln's administration came the high-water mark of the exercise of sheer executive authority. His unreserved acceptance of the dogma of a popular tribuneship led him, by mere executive order, to increase the army and navy, take millions of dollars of unappropriated money from the treasury, prescribe an elaborate code of army field regulations and otherwise admittedly to contravene specific constitutional prescriptions (Nicolay and Hay, *Works of Lincoln*, X, pp. 65-68). He had sharp controversies with Congress concerning executive powers and only his assassination saved him from a postwar conflict over this issue.

The Presidency suffered a partial eclipse in the generation following the Civil War, Congress having gained the ascendancy. President Johnson (1865-69) was impeached⁹⁹ and almost removed from office. President Grant (1869-77) signally failed to assume the leadership confidently expected of him. The attitude of Congress denied Hayes (1877-81), Garfield and Arthur (1881-85) effective co-operation with it, while Cleveland's sturdy independence provoked open hostility. By the middle of the 1880's a presidential recommendation to Congress received no more consideration than an article in a prominent party newspaper (James Bryce, *American Commonwealth*, I, 230-31).

It was the practised political skill of President McKinley (1897-1901) in dealing with Congress that revived presidential prestige. The adeptness of his successor, Theodore Roosevelt (1901-9), in bringing public opinion to bear upon Congress and the consequent enactment of a progressive legislative program shifted the center of gravity in the Government decisively to the President. Woodrow Wilson (1913-21), declaring the President to be a prime minister like a parliamentary party chief, demonstrated the practicability of his doctrine by putting through Congress a deliberately planned series of statutes. F. D. Roosevelt followed Wilson's method closely

in managing the passage of his New Deal^{er} measures. Since 1900 the function of the President as the "chief legislator" has developed to the point where each President now bases his claim for popular approval not upon executive achievements but upon the legislative enactments of Congress during his administration.

[W. E. Binkley, *Powers of the President*.]

W. E. BINKLEY

President, THE, a 44-gun frigate built in New York, 1794-1800, first came to public notice when, in 1811, off the Chesapeake, under John Rodgers, she replied with a withering broadside to a suspicious shot, fired in the darkness, by the British *Little Belt*. As just retribution for British insults this delighted Americans. Rodgers fired the first shot of the War of 1812 in a chase of the *Belvidera*, and cruised extensively but with no victories and few prizes^{er}.

After being blockaded in New York for a year, the *President*, then under Stephen Decatur, escaped to sea on Jan. 14, 1815, but was overtaken, first by the British frigate *Endymion*, which she finally crippled, and then by the frigates *Tenedos* and *Pomone*. Surrounded by superior forces, Decatur, himself twice wounded, felt obliged to surrender, a decision criticized by Mahan but approved by public opinion of his day. The *President* was taken to Bermuda and then to Spithead, but never saw service under the British flag.

[A. T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812*.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

President, War Powers of. See War Powers of President.

Presidential Elections. See Election of the President; Campaigns of various years.

Presidential Exemption from Subpœna. Thomas Cooper criticized acts of President Adams and was tried for violation of the sedition act^{er} in 1800. Cooper asked the Court to issue a subpœna for President Adams so that he could prove the truth of the allegedly seditious statements. Judge Chase forbade summoning the President and declared the attempt to subpœna him an improper and indecent act.

This question arose again during the trial of Aaron Burr^{er} in 1807. Chief Justice Marshall declared that the President was subject to subpœna because no distinction was made as to persons subject to such compulsory processes of the Court. It was true that English law did make an exception in the case of the king, but between the King of England and the President of the United States there was a vast difference. Finally, Marshall said that if there was any ground on

which a President could claim exemption, it must be that national business demanded his whole time. But this was no reason why the process should not be issued though it might be a reason why the process should not be obeyed. Marshall issued the subpœna. President Jefferson flatly refused to appear. There was no way of forcing his appearance, and a precedent was established to the effect that the President could not be subpœnaed into court against his will.

[J. B. McMaster, *A History of the People of the United States*.]

CHARLES MARION THOMAS

Presidential Title. The title for the new Executive was the subject of some controversy at the Convention of 1787^{er}, as was the question of titular etiquette in general. The Committee of Detail recommended that "The Executive Power of the United States shall be vested in a single Person. His Stile shall be, 'The President of the United States of America', and his Title shall be, 'His Excellency.'" The Committee on Style reported more simply, "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America" and this was the formulation adopted.

The contest over titles was continued into the First Congress. Shortly after he was installed as Vice-President, John Adams lectured the Senate on the necessity and propriety of titles and some three weeks of the opening deliberations were consumed in debating this matter. A Senate committee, after deciding that the ambassadorial "His Excellency" was too paltry for the ruler of a young republic, urged that the Executive be addressed as "His Highness, the President of the United States of America and Protector of their Liberties," and it is stated that this was the title which George Washington preferred. The more republican House of Representatives remained obdurate, however, and the Senate, while feeling that "it would be proper to annex a respectable title to the office," was "desirous of preserving harmony with the House of Representatives" and agreed "That the present address be 'To the President of the United States,' without addition of title."

The practice of restricting the use of titles to the simple constitutional or statutory designation of the office has never been deviated from since. "Excellency" has sometimes been applied by private persons, but the formal style of addressing the President or any officer in his official capacity is simply by the title of his office, and nothing else.

[Max Farrand, ed., *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*; L. H. Irvine, *Dictionary of Titles*; Randolph

Keim, *Society in Washington*; H. T. Peck, *Native Titles in the United States*, *Cosmopolitan*, XXVIII.]

ERIC CYRIL BELLQUIST

Presidents: Absences from American Soil.

For well over a century, no President, during his term of office, ventured to leave the bounds of continental United States. This was due partly to fear for the safety of the Chief Executive, and partly, perhaps, to sentimental reasons. Even such great travelers as Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft so arranged their trips as to conform to this established practice. Woodrow Wilson, however, made two trips to Europe in 1918 and 1919, as a member and chairman of the American delegation to the Peace Conference⁹⁷. He arrived in Paris Dec. 14, 1918, and March 13, 1919. Warren G. Harding went to Alaska, from whence he had just returned at the time of his death in San Francisco, in 1923. Calvin Coolidge attended the Sixth Pan-American Conference⁹⁸ at Havana, in 1928. Franklin D. Roosevelt was out of the country on several occasions during his term of office. In July, 1934, he visited Haiti and Colombia, as well as the territorial possessions of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Panama and Hawaii. In 1936 he attended the Pan-American Conference at Buenos Aires⁹⁹, and visited Canada, exchanging greetings, in French, with the Prime Minister of Quebec. In the summer of 1937 he took a vacation trip which again carried him outside of the United States. Thus, under modern conditions of communication and transportation, was a century-old tradition broken.

[Mary V. Pennington and John R. Bolling, *Chronology of Woodrow Wilson*; Franklin D. Roosevelt, *Public Papers and Addresses*.]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Presidents, Special Powers Granted to. That Congress¹⁰⁰ cannot delegate its legislative power to the President¹⁰¹ is a maxim of United States constitutional law. Yet there have been numerous instances where special powers have been granted to the Chief Executive.

After Congress has exercised the chief discretion or determined the policy of the Government, the President may, within limits fixed by the law, issue instructions and regulations to supplement the legislation. This procedure, which has developed by custom, is referred to as the exercise of "ordinance-making power."

Occasionally, Congress has left so much to the discretion of the Executive that he has appeared to be exercising lawmaking power rather than ordinance-making power. Nevertheless, prior to 1935, when test cases were taken to the Supreme Court, that tribunal consistently held that there

had been no delegation of legislative power in violation of the principle of separation of powers¹⁰².

During periods of war or other emergency, Congress has been subjected to heavy pressure to delegate extraordinary powers to the President. Nevertheless, during the Civil War, the national legislature was reluctant to take such action. This did not deter President Lincoln who, broadly interpreting his authority as commander in chief, proceeded to exercise most drastic powers. For example, he ordered the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus¹⁰³; he had persons outside of the war zone arrested and tried by military tribunals (*see* Milligan Case); and he issued the Emancipation Proclamation¹⁰⁴. Some of his actions were sharply criticized in Congress and by the Supreme Court.

In contrast to this hostility to Lincoln's use of special powers was the attitude of Congress and the Court toward President Wilson during the World War. Congress, in 1917 and 1918, unhesitatingly granted to President Wilson the broadest sort of discretion to deal with the war problems. As a result, the President was able to decide not only the nation's military policies but he was able to set up special organizations to control the nation's economic life. Through his power it was possible to control the conduct of industry, finance, labor, foreign trade, communication and transportation, and the production and distribution of food and fuel.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt became President in 1933, he proceeded immediately to copy the methods employed during the World War. At his request, numerous laws were passed in 1933 and later granting him special powers to deal with the economic "emergency" created by the great depression which had started in 1929. As a result of these grants, President Roosevelt, either directly or indirectly, exercised control over relief, money and banking, agriculture, industry, labor relations and foreign trade¹⁰⁵. In fact, from 1933 to 1935 his power over the country's economic life was probably greater than that exercised by any of his predecessors, even by President Wilson.

In 1935 the Supreme Court, in the so-called "Hot Oil" and Schechter cases¹⁰⁶, held that legislative powers had been unconstitutionally delegated to the President. These decisions, however, imposed only a partial limit on the President's delegated powers.

[Erik McKinley Eriksson and David Nelson Rowe, *American Constitutional History*; C. A. Berdahl, *War Powers of the Executive in the United States*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

President's Message. Despite their faith in the dogma of separated powers⁷⁷, the framers of the Constitution (*see* Convention of 1787) assigned the President a positive legislative function in the provision. "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient" (Art. 2, Sec. 3). Presidents Washington and John Adams made their addresses in person to Congress in imitation of the "speech from the throne," the Representatives coming to the Senate chamber and Congress voting an address in reply, all after the manner of English parliamentary procedure (H. J. Ford, *Washington and His Colleagues*, p. 20). Jefferson, the third President, instituted instead (1801) the "republican" practice of sending written messages to be read in both Houses by the clerks, thus establishing a new precedent not to be broken in the next century.

Some notable presidential messages have been the Monroe Doctrine (1823), Jackson's Bank Veto (1832), Wilson's "Fourteen Points" (1918) and the recommendations of declarations of war. The President's message probably became least significant in the 1880's (*see* President, The). Somewhat later Theodore Roosevelt revitalized the message, employing it to arouse public interest, and Woodrow Wilson returned (1913) to the early practice of addressing Congress in person in conscious imitation of a prime minister. Methods of conveying the message since then have varied, with F. D. Roosevelt following closely the practice of Wilson.

In addition to the annual message, usually covering a wide range of information provided by the departments, Presidents send also special messages accompanying vetoes, requested correspondence, answers to inquiries and recommended special legislation. The annual message is published in practically all daily papers and is widely read.

[F. A. Ogg and P. O. Ray, *Introduction to American Government*.]

W. E. BINKLEY

Presidents of the United States. The terms of the Presidents have begun and ended on the fourth of March following election, with the following exceptions. Washington took the oath for his first term April 30, 1789. Six Presidents died in office and were succeeded by Vice-Presidents, who served the remainder of the terms: William Henry Harrison died April 4, 1841; Zachary Taylor, July 9, 1850; Abraham Lincoln, April 15, 1865; James A. Garfield, Sept. 19, 1881; William McKinley, Sept. 14, 1901; and

Warren G. Harding, Aug. 2, 1923. The Twentieth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, declared ratified Feb. 6, 1933, provides that the terms of the President and Vice-President shall end and begin on the twentieth of January succeeding election. Therefore President F. D. Roosevelt began his second term Jan. 20, 1937.

1789-1797	George Washington
1797-1801	John Adams
1801-1809	Thomas Jefferson
1809-1817	James Madison
1817-1825	James Monroe
1825-1829	John Quincy Adams
1829-1837	Andrew Jackson
1837-1841	Martin Van Buren
1841-1845	{ William Henry Harrison John Tyler
1845-1849	James K. Polk
1849-1853	{ Zachary Taylor Millard Fillmore
1853-1857	Franklin Pierce
1857-1861	James Buchanan
1861-1865	Abraham Lincoln
1865-1869	{ Abraham Lincoln Andrew Johnson
1869-1877	Ulysses S. Grant
1877-1881	Rutherford B. Hayes
1881-1885	{ James A. Garfield Chester Alan Arthur
1885-1889	Grover Cleveland
1889-1893	Benjamin Harrison
1893-1897	Grover Cleveland
1897-1901	William McKinley
1901-1905	{ William McKinley Theodore Roosevelt
1905-1909	Theodore Roosevelt
1909-1913	William Howard Taft
1913-1921	Woodrow Wilson
1921-1925	{ Warren G. Harding Calvin Coolidge
1925-1929	Calvin Coolidge
1929-1933	Herbert Hoover
1933-	Franklin D. Roosevelt

RALPH FOSTER WELD

Presidio, THE, was a Spanish institution established primarily to hold the frontiers in America against foreign aggressors and to protect the missions. *Presidios* were forts or posts where soldiers lived with their families and cultivated the land around them. The number of soldiers varied; along the northern frontier there were seldom more than fifty residing at a *presidio*. The

presidios were not entirely self-supporting because they received subsidies from the viceroy of Mexico. They were located in California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, the West Indies, and Spanish Florida which at the time included Georgia and the Carolinas.

[L. E. Fisher, *Viceregal Administration in the Spanish American Colonies*.]

LILLIAN ESTELLE FISHER

Presque Isle, Fort, was constructed on the shore of Lake Erie at the present site of Erie, Pa., under the direction of the engineer, Le Mercier, attached to the French command of Capt. Pierre Paul Marin. Work was begun in the late spring of 1753 and was completed in June or July of that year. Thenceforth to 1759, this fort of chestnut logs fifteen feet high, "about 120 feet square, a log house in each square [each corner], a gate to the southward and another to the N. ward," served as a base of operations for the further projection of the Pennsylvania line of French forts, LeBoeuf, Machault and Duquesne^{qv}, and for the transportation of troops and supplies from Montreal to Duquesne. After the French abandoned it on Aug. 13, 1759, the British utilized it as a frontier outpost in dealing with hostile Indians of the region. During the general Indian uprising of 1763 (*see* Pontiac War, The), however, the Indians captured the fort on June 22 and burned it. A subsequent fortification, designated as Presque Isle, was erected on a near-by site in the summer of 1795 to protect the commissioners who were laying out the town of Erie, but nothing was done to restore the original French fort.

[Pennsylvania Indian Forts Commission, *Report of the Commission to Locate the Site of the Frontier Forts of Pennsylvania*, 2 vols., Harrisburg, C. M. Busch, State Printer, 1892.]

R. J. FERGUSON

Press, Freedom of the. *See* Freedom of the Press.

Press Gang. England never devised an orderly procedure for impressment^{qv}, or conscription for naval service. In practice, captains of shorthanded men-of-war scoured English water fronts, or boarded merchantmen, with armed details to exercise direct and immediate conscription. Lieutenants commanding these "press gangs" were ruthlessly indiscriminating. The practice in colonial ports was a minor cause of the American Revolution^{qv}. Applied to American merchantmen after independence, it was a major cause of the War of 1812^{qv}.

[J. F. Zimmerman, *Impressment of American Seamen*.]

JIM DAN HILL

Pressing to Death. According to former English judicial practice, if a person accused of a felony contumaciously refused to plead either guilty or not guilty and so blocked his trial, weights might be placed on his chest until he pleaded. The accused sometimes endured the "*peine forte et dure*" because if found guilty after pleading not guilty, their estates might be confiscated. The practice was apparently very rare in the American colonies, the only recorded instance of it being the case of Giles Corey, who was accused of witchcraft^{qv} in Salem in 1692, and suffocated under the weights rather than endanger the inheritance of his children.

[G. L. Burr, ed., *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648-1706*.]

CLIFFORD K. SHIPTON

Pressure Groups. Those organized minorities which use political and social pressure to influence the decisions of legislative and administrative officers are properly called pressure groups. In general such groups fall into one of two main classes: (1) special interest groups—economic or professional—such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor and the American Farm Bureau Federation, and (2) those which may be called social-interest groups, devoted ostensibly at least to the promotion of social, economic, or political reforms, such as the League of Women Voters, the Anti-Saloon League, innumerable peace and patriotic societies, religious and reform organizations. It is impossible to estimate the total number of such groups in the United States. Between 500 and 1000 maintain permanent headquarters in Washington, D. C. Hundreds of others, organized locally or as branches of national organizations, exert pressure upon city and state governments.

In their attitude toward public policies, pressure groups are as a rule nonpartisan. The fact that a candidate or representative may be a Republican or Democrat is less important than the fact that he may be high tariff or low tariff, wet or dry. The methods used in exerting pressure have altered somewhat with changes in party organization, nominating methods, legislative procedure and administrative organization but essentially they remain what they have been for over a hundred years. Contributions to party campaign funds, dissemination of propaganda favorable to one faction as against another, direct negotiation with and pressure upon party leaders are among the usual intra-party methods of pressure groups. The more powerful groups maintain special representatives, so-called lobbyists^{qv} or legislative counsel, in Washington

and at state capitals. It is customary for these representatives to entertain, socially, key-persons in the public service, with a view to insuring their friendly support of particular measures. The influence of the "social lobby," while important, is easily exaggerated, as are the frequent rumors of open and covert bribery of public servants by agents of special interests. The more important work of these lobbyists is in their appearance before legislative committees and administrative boards, and in their daily contact with those in official positions, to consult, advise, and warn them of the pressure groups' attitude toward a given line of policy. Very often they draft legislation which is then introduced and sponsored by friendly representatives. But their activities are not confined to state and national capitals. They must, on occasion, appeal to the country—to the voters in whose hands rests the ultimate fate of all responsible public servants. In doing this every device known to modern publicity is employed—newspaper releases, radio broadcasts, public meetings and even motion pictures.

To reinforce the lobbyists' influence it is often necessary to mobilize public opinion on some pending issue, by bringing to the capital delegations of citizens to impress public officials. Pressure is brought also by stimulating the "folks back home" to send petitions, memorials, letters and telegrams of protest or commendation to their representatives. It is not unusual on critical issues where extensive and powerful groups are involved for such communications to run into hundreds of thousands.

It is difficult to appraise the influence of pressure groups in American history. The part played by lobbyists for land, canal and railroad companies is well known. Tariff legislation has, from the beginning, been beaten out on the anvil of rival groups pressure. The Anti-Saloon League claimed credit for twenty acts of Congress and a constitutional amendment. The U. S. Chamber of Commerce believes its pressure chiefly responsible for the national budget law, tariff commission act, Federal Reserve Act, Transportation Act of 1920, Branch Banking Act and the Rogers Act of 1924. Organized labor and patriotic groups have played a conspicuous role in determining American immigration policies.

Persistent demands have been made for governmental regulation of pressure groups. Congressional investigations have alleviated some of the most flagrant practices but repeated attempts at national legislation have failed. State requirements of registration and the filing of

expense accounts by lobbyists are unsatisfactory.

[Harwood L. Childs, ed., *Pressure Groups and Propaganda*, *Annals American Academy*, Vol. 179, May, 1935; E. P. Herring, *Group Representation before Congress*, Edward B. Logan, *Lobbying*, *Annals American Academy*, supplement to Vol. CXLIV, July, 1929, Peter Odegard, *Pressure Politics*.]

PETLR H. ODEGARD
DONALD BISHOP

Pribilof Islands, THE, in the Bering Sea, were ceded to the United States by Russia at the time of the purchase of Alaska[™] in 1867. These islands were the summer breeding grounds of the largest known herd of seals and became the subject of a controversy between the United States, Great Britain and other nations whose subjects were slaughtering the seals for their fur. In 1869 Congress passed a law restricting the sealing. An American cutter seized British vessels engaged in pelagic sealing in 1886. The British government vigorously protested. An arbitral tribunal, agreed to in 1892, decided adversely to the United States. Finally the dispute was settled, in 1911, by a Convention between Great Britain, Russia, Japan and the United States (*see Seal Fisheries*).

[J. H. Latané, *A History of American Foreign Policy*.]

CHARLES MARION THOMAS

Price Fixing. This term has a variety of possible meanings, but it is generally understood to refer to some form of government price control. Between 1620 and 1640 the Virginia Assembly attempted, with no great success, to fix the price of leaf tobacco as a means of protecting the tobacco planters from the machinations of English merchants, and this appears to be about the first definite attempt at price fixing in America.

The next important attempt at government price fixing came in the Middle West in the early 1870's when several states attempted to fix railroad rates by law. These attempts were upheld by the Supreme Court in 1876 in the case of *Munn v. Illinois*[™]. In 1886, however, the right of a state to regulate railroad rates was limited to movements which originated and terminated within its borders (*Wabash Case*, 118 U. S. 557), a restriction that practically nullified the laws because about three fourths of the traffic crossed state lines at this time. The Federal Government entered this field in 1887, but it was not until 1906 that its power to fix rates was effectively exercised. Similar attempts on the part of state and local authorities to fix public utility rates have met with varying degrees of success.

When the United States entered the World War in 1917, the prices of many basic commodities skyrocketed because the sudden increase in governmental purchases threw the normal rela-

tionships between demand and supply out of equilibrium. In time these higher prices would have called forth increased production and a corresponding drop in prices, but such a process takes time, and the emergency would probably be over before the necessary adjustments had taken place. In order to avoid paying excessive prices the Government undertook to fix the selling prices of a large number of essential commodities. It could not, of course, fix prices below cost of production, but when it set out to determine the cost of production of the different commodities it proposed to buy, it found the widest discrepancies in the cost of producing an identical article in different plants. If it had fixed the price of a given article at that point which would have met the costs of the highest cost plant, it would have drawn out maximum production, but this would have meant fixing the price at a very high point and also would have meant excessive profits for low cost producers. On the other hand, if it had fixed the price so as to meet the costs of the low cost producers, it would have meant a substantial falling off in total production because the higher cost producers could not afford to do business at such prices. In order to avoid these difficulties the Government decided to fix prices at that point which would enable all but the very high cost producers to operate, thus drawing out almost all of the potential production. The Government's efforts to control prices during the war were quite successful on the whole, but they were, of course, abandoned after the emergency was passed.

Price fixing of a semiofficial nature appeared in the National Industrial Recovery Act⁷⁰ codes but was abandoned after the act was declared unconstitutional, and has not been reintroduced. During the early years of the New Deal⁷¹, the prices of agricultural products were regulated by means of a system of crop restrictions, and after this was declared unconstitutional, efforts were made to continue price control through voluntary acreage reduction programs. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration⁷² program differed markedly from the wartime program in that its arrangement was designed to *raise* prices instead of keeping them from going too high.

[Raymond T. Bye and William W. Hewett, *Applied Economics*.]

R. E. WESTMEYER

Price in Missouri (1861-64). Sterling Price, a former congressman and governor of Missouri and leader in the Mexican War, was elected on Feb. 18, 1861, as a Union man to, and became

president of, the Missouri convention which was to determine Missouri's attitude toward secession⁷³. The majority of its ninety-nine members was for a compromise between the North and South which would preserve the Union.

Gov. Jackson attempted to keep Missouri neutral in the war. He refused to send volunteers to President Lincoln and organized the state militia to keep Federal troops out of the state. Capt. Lyon's capture of Camp Jackson⁷⁴, in St. Louis, drove Price into the disunion camp and many Missourians, who had thus far been in doubt, followed him.

Price, put in command of the Missouri State Guard by Gov. Jackson, organized his army in southwest Missouri and met Lyon at Wilson's Creek⁷⁵, near Springfield, on Aug. 10, 1861. Lyon was killed and Price went north and captured Lexington⁷⁶ on Sept. 20. The advance of Frémont (U.) into southeast Missouri made Price's position dangerous so he retreated to Springfield and when Curtis (U.) pushed after him he retreated into Arkansas and joined Van Dorn, the Confederate general. They fought Curtis at Pea Ridge⁷⁷, Ark., March 6-8, 1862, and were forced to retreat.

After Pea Ridge, Price and 5000 of his men joined the Confederacy and were transferred east of the Mississippi (*see* Iuka, Battle of). Later he returned to Arkansas and was engaged in the Red River Campaign and at Jenkins Ferry⁷⁸. In 1864 he made his famous raid into Missouri. Entering from the southeast, with 12,000 men, he went north to Pilot Knob⁷⁹, then toward Jefferson City, but could not capture the capital. He then swung west toward Independence and destroyed the railroads, bridges and telegraph wires behind him. He was caught between Curtis' and Pleasanton's (U.) armies at Westport⁸⁰, in what is now Kansas City, and his army nearly destroyed. He managed to escape southward and into Arkansas but his army suffered heavy losses of men and supplies. The raid was a failure from every standpoint. Price did not return to Missouri until after the war.

[E. M. Violette, *History of Missouri*.]

W. FRANCIS ENGLISH

Price Maintenance. Until 1870 retail and wholesale prices were largely determined by individual bargaining. A few department stores⁸¹ inaugurated the one-price system, and this soon became general practice. Some manufacturers went further, stipulating the price at which retailers should sell their trade-marked⁸² merchandise. They met with little resistance until after 1908, when the problem of maintaining

prices became acute because of the growth of national advertising⁹⁰ and of large-scale retailers.

Advertisers of drugs, groceries and other widely used products needed many retail outlets. These in turn demanded a profit margin large enough to cover costs. However, chain stores, mail-order houses, and some department stores⁹¹ aimed to attract customers by offering prices lower than elsewhere. They sought to demonstrate savings in general by conspicuously large savings on popular books and well-known advertised brands; and attempts to prevent ruinous price-cutting were not upheld by the Supreme Court. After unfavorable decisions in 1911 and 1913, a group of manufacturers organized the Fair Trade League to work for Federal price maintenance laws. The movement languished as price-cutting practically disappeared during the World War. Later, some manufacturers secured general observance of standard prices, usually by methods whereby the retailer acted as an agent and did not take title to the goods.

After 1929 small retailers, alarmed by the growth of chain stores, worked for state laws to curb them. In 1931 California druggists secured passage of an act permitting producers to make agreements with jobbers and dealers as to the resale price of branded products in intrastate trade. An amendment in 1933 made such contracts binding on all jobbers and retailers. By 1938 forty-three states had similar Fair Trade laws. A Federal act made such contracts legal in interstate commerce (*see Robinson-Patman Act*). Book publishers and many national advertisers have taken advantage of this legislation.

[E. R. A. Seligman and R. A. Love, *Price Cutting and Price Maintenance*, R. Johnson, W. H. Ingersoll and G. Montague, *The Control of Resale Prices*.]

G. B. HOTCHKISS

Prices in Colonial Times are not recorded in continuous series or standard value units. Often they register barter ratios between commodities. Sometimes the law made these commodities legal tender but failed to give them fixed valuations. Statutory prices of tobacco, beaver, wool, hemp and other produce receivable for taxes were invariably higher than prevailing market rates. Money quotations, which became more common as trade developed, were in fluctuating currencies. Disastrous depreciation at times wiped out the value of colonial paper money, and silver was "managed" by manipulating ratios between colonial shillings of account and the sterling and Spanish coins which constituted the scanty hard money in local use (*see Currency, Colonial*).

Although these monetary eccentricities complicate computations, general trends can be

traced in colonial price history wherever we have sufficient records. During the first century of settlement only major movements can be distinguished. These were generally caused by wars, embargoes, or the infantile diseases of new settlements. Such a recession befell Massachusetts about 1640 when the Civil War in England suddenly stopped migration to America and local prices in the colonies fell abruptly to one fourth their previous level. A more protracted but less precipitate decline occurred in Virginia and Maryland between 1640 and 1675 when the rapid extension of tobacco cultivation reduced the price of that staple from nearly three shillings to two pence a pound, or to one sixteenth of its former value.

After 1720 records are sufficiently complete to afford wholesale price series of leading exports like grain and provisions, lumber, naval stores, hemp and other raw materials and of important imports like sugar, molasses, rum, salt, tea and Madeira wine. These reveal nine cycles in the Philadelphia market between that date and 1775 and a long upswing beginning in 1721 in Philadelphia and somewhat later in New York and New England which continued with minor cyclical setbacks until the Revolution.

Prices varied more from season to season and year to year than they normally do at present. Wars and embargoes usually depressed prices of local commodities for a time and raised those of imports. Between 1720 and 1775 wheat ranged in the Philadelphia market from 35 cents to \$1.10 a bushel, rice from 75 cents to \$2.70, and corn from 30 cents to 65 cents. Flour was sometimes as low as \$1.02 a cwt. but during local scarcity rose to three times that amount. Salt, indispensable for maintaining the colonial provision trade, ranged from 30 cents to 65 cents a bushel. Molasses seldom cost more than 30 cents a gallon while rum distilled from it usually commanded 40 or 50 cents. Bohea tea declined gradually from about \$4 a pound in 1720 to less than 65 cents half a century later. Meanwhile loaf sugar to sweeten it was quoted at from 12 to 20 cents a pound, according as the West India trade⁹² was free or interrupted, and muscovado sugar wholesaled at from \$4 to \$7.50 a cwt.

What prices meant in family budgets must be considered in connection with prevailing living standards. Except in larger towns late in the colonial era even the poorest people commonly had enough coarse food, clothing and shelter. Wages, which frequently included board, ranged from 40 cents a day in the Northern colonies and somewhat less in the South for common laborers to over twice that sum for skilled me-

chanics. Country board cost about a dollar a week, but professional men in towns paid two and three times that amount. Market assizes sometimes regulated prices of bread and beer according to the cost of grain and fixed rates for other commodities in common use. West Indian cotton—before the invention of the saw gin—brought from 14 to 30 cents a pound or rather more than wool. Flax and hemp were the cheapest textile fibers. Homespun woollens ranged from 50 cents to one dollar a yard while imported broadcloth cost two or three dollars. Calicoes retailed at 25 and 30 cents a yard as did ordinary sheetings. This seems to have been a common price for popular fabrics since linsey-woolsey⁹⁹ and homespun linens sold at approximately the same rates. The wool hats commonly worn by men cost from 40 to 80 cents according to quality, but gentlemen's "beavers" cost up to three dollars. Men's shoes which ranged from 50 to 75 cents a pair in the early days of settlement doubled in price by the time of the Revolution. Though retail price trends cannot be shown precisely for lack of data, the cost of living and the remuneration of labor were obviously rising during the later decades of the colonial period. Probably at no time, however, did wages and the cost of simple necessities exceed one fifth of their present rate. The ratio of wages to prices has changed much less than their respective equivalents in human effort and consumption goods.

[A. H. Cole, *Wholesale Commodity Prices in the United States, 1700-1861*; Bezanson, Gray and Hussey, *Prices in Colonial Pennsylvania*; C. P. Nettels, *The Money Supply of the American Colonies before 1720*; V. S. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States*.] VICTOR S. CLARK

Prigg v. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1842). In 1832 a slave fled from Maryland to Pennsylvania. Five years later Edward Prigg, an agent, seized her and, upon a magistrate's refusal to take cognizance of the case, returned her to the owner. Prigg was then indicted for kidnapping, in the York county court, under a Pennsylvania statute of 1826 relating to fugitive slave labor. Judgment for the Commonwealth was affirmed by the supreme court of Pennsylvania in 1840. The State of Maryland then prosecuted a writ of error to the Supreme Court. The unanimous opinion of the Court, written by Mr. Justice Story, declared the Pennsylvania statute unconstitutional because the Federal Fugitive Slave Act of 1793⁹⁹ superseded all state legislation on the subject. But the Court sharply divided over Story's statement that the power of Congress was so exclusive as to render invalid every state statute on the subject, a statement denounced

by both proslavery and antislavery men. Many Northern states expressed dissatisfaction by passing so-called Personal Liberty Laws⁹⁹.

[Albert B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition*; Charles Warren, *The Supreme Court in United States History*.]

J. PAUL SELSAM

Primary, Direct. Historically, the direct primary is the third major device employed by American democracy in making nominations to public office. It was preceded (1) by the congressional caucus⁹⁹ which dated from the colonial period and was continued to about 1830; and (2) by the delegate convention (*see* Conventions, Party Nominating) which prevailed generally from 1830 to the beginning of the present century (*see also* Caucus, Primary). Credit for the invention of the direct primary is ascribed to Crawford County, Pa., in which as early as 1842 power to make nominations was taken by the Democratic party from the county convention and placed in the hands of the voters. Hailed as a revival of true democracy, the "Crawford County Plan" was adopted subsequently by many counties in Middle, Western and Southern states. In all cases, however, it rested solely on the basis of local party rules. Not until 1903 was the principle of nomination by direct vote of party members enacted into law by the legislature of Wisconsin acting under the influence of LaFollette progressives. At present the direct primary has been established by law in all but three of the states.

Like the initiative, referendum and recall⁹⁹ the operation of the direct primary begins with the circulation of petitions which must be signed by a certain number or percentage of the voters of a party in the local government district or state concerned. Requirements range from five signatures in the case of minor local offices to a thousand or more for higher state offices. In a number of states percentages of the party vote ranging from one half of one per cent to 4% are required. Candidates who receive the required number of signatures thereby gain the right to have their names printed upon the official ballot, decision among them following by vote of party members at the ensuing primary election. Direct primaries are of two kinds, "open" or "closed." The former, used in Wisconsin and Montana, impose no test of party allegiance. In closed primaries, which are becoming the general rule, some evidence of party affiliation is required of the voter.

[C. E. Merriam and L. Overacker, *Primary Elections*.] ROBERT C. BROOKS

Primary, Run-Off. Under the direct primary⁹⁹ system, the vote is frequently so divided among

numerous candidates that the successful winner of a plurality may represent only a small fraction of the electorate. A number of states, mostly in the South, now require a second or "run-off" primary between the two contestants having the largest vote, unless the leader has an actual majority.

[R. C. Brooks, *Political Parties and Electoral Problems*; H. R. Bruce, *American Parties and Politics*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Primogeniture. In general, primogeniture implies seniority by birth though legally it connotes the right of the eldest son to inherit the estate of a parent to the exclusion of all other heirs. Its wide use in mediæval England followed the introduction of Continental feudalism by the Normans who stressed the wishes of a lord to keep his holdings intact so as to insure the rents, fees and military services arising from these tenures. Otherwise, a vassal might distribute his tenure among his sons in a way that would defeat the economic basis of the feudal structure. By the 14th century practically all free tenures were subject to primogeniture, though by a statute of 1540 land held in fee simple, as well as many feudal tenures, could be willed. Feudal tenures were abolished in 1662, since which all freehold^{er} land could be willed. By this time feudalism^{er}, except for the manorial system, had seen its best days. And while feudalism influenced institutional development in America, it was chiefly in its manorial aspects that primogeniture affected the New World.

Primogeniture existed in all of the original thirteen colonies. In New England, except for Rhode Island, stout opposition gradually reduced this form of inheritance so that by the Revolution it had practically disappeared. In Massachusetts, however, the parent had to will a double share to the eldest son. This was also true of Pennsylvania. In New York and the Southern colonies, where economic and social forces favored large estates, primogeniture generally prevailed, much to the dissatisfaction of those who viewed the institution as an alien and undesirable practice. The movement for free and equitable inheritance was fostered by those sponsoring the American Revolution. Stimulated by the democratic philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, the Virginia assembly attacked the system and finally in 1785 abolished it. Georgia and North Carolina had done the same in 1777 and 1784 respectively. The other states followed this lead, though it was not until 1798 that Rhode Island abolished primogeniture. Since that date primogeniture has not operated in America, though in some states entailed^{er} estates descend to the eldest son.

Princeton Explosion

[R. B. Morris, *Primogeniture and Entailed Estates in America*, in *Columbia Law Review*, XXVII.]

W. FREEMAN GALPIN

Prince George, Fort, was built in November, 1753, by Gov. James Glen of South Carolina. It was placed on the eastern side of the Keowee River opposite the Cherokee^{er} town of that name. The fort was 200 feet square with earthen walls and timber ravelins; designed as frontier and Indian trade defense it stood successfully the Cherokee attacks of 1759-61.

[D. D. Wallace, *History of South Carolina*.]

R. L. MERIWETHER

Princeton, Battle of (Jan. 3, 1777). Leaving three regiments at Princeton, Cornwallis arrived at the Delaware toward sunset, Jan. 2, to avenge Trenton^{er}. Here he found Washington's army of 5000 men occupying a precarious position along Assunpink Creek. Convinced the latter had no means of escape and ignoring Sir William Erskine's counsel to attack immediately, he decided to "bag him" in the morning. Washington, advised by St. Clair, executed a brilliant military maneuver. At midnight, leaving his camp fires burning, he quietly withdrew his main body along an unpicketed road, and gained the British rear. Approaching Princeton, about daybreak, the Americans encountered a force under Col. Mawhood, just leaving that village to join Cornwallis. Gen. Mercer's brigade engaged Mawhood's troops at close range but was driven back with the bayonet. Rallied by Washington and joined by new arrivals, the patriots, with deadly rifle fire, drove the enemy from the field and village with losses estimated between 400 and 600 in killed, wounded and prisoners. Cornwallis, outgeneraled, withdrew his entire army in feverish haste to New Brunswick to save a £70,000 war chest, while Washington, his army wearied, took up a strong position at Morristown^{er}, having freed New Jersey and infused new life and hope into a cause that appeared all but lost.

[S. G. Fisher, *The Struggle for American Independence*.]

C. A. TITUS

Princeton, Explosion on the (Feb. 28, 1844). The *Princeton*, the first screw warship, carried a 12-inch gun, the *Peacemaker*, devised by R. F. Stockton, its commander, and the largest yet forged for the American navy. While a party of about 200 government officials, including President Tyler, and their ladies were cruising down the Potomac aboard the *Princeton*, the gun was fired to entertain the company. It burst and

killed Secretary of State Upshur, Secretary of Navy Gilmer and several others.

[F. M. Bennett, *The Steam Navy of the United States*; W. C. Church, *Life of John Ericsson*.]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Princeton University, chartered in 1746 as the College of New Jersey, was founded by a group of Presbyterians⁷⁰ to provide an institution of higher learning for the Middle Colonies. The college opened in Elizabeth-Town, N. J. (1747), moved to Newark, N. J. (1748), and to Princeton, N. J. (1756), where Nassau Hall had been erected.

Princeton men contributed to the forming of the nation: President John Witherspoon and two graduates, Richard Stockton and Dr. Benjamin Rush, signed the Declaration of Independence⁷¹; and nine alumni, including James Madison, William Paterson and Oliver Ellsworth, sat in the Convention of 1787⁷².

In 1896, reflecting the development of graduate instruction begun during the administration of James McCosh (1868-88), the name of the College was changed to Princeton University. Throughout its growth, it has adhered to the charter definition of a nonsectarian institution "wherein youth may be instructed in the learned languages and in the liberal arts and sciences." Always a bulwark of the humanities, it has, during the 20th century, strengthened a pure-science tradition which stems from Joseph Henry, faculty member (1832-48) and pioneer student of electromagnetism. A contribution to education is the preceptorial method of instruction evolved by Woodrow Wilson while president of the university (1902-10).

[V. L. Collins, *Princeton*; Official Register of Princeton University, *General Information*.]

FREDERICK S. OSBORNE

Principio Company, THE. A bloomery forge, built in Maryland in 1715 at the head of the Chesapeake Bay, was the origin of the Principio Iron Works. In 1718 the first quantity of bar iron exported from the colonies to England was made at this forge. In 1722 the members of the Principio Company included Joseph Farmer, Stephen Onion, William Chetwynd, Joshua Gee, William Russell, John England and John Ruston, English capitalists, ironmasters and merchants. They built the Principio Furnace, which went into operation in 1724. The next year the company made an agreement with Augustine Washington, father of George Washington, by which the former became a member of the company. Mines were opened on Washington's lands and the Accokeek Furnace, Virginia, was built. On the death of Augustine Washington, Law-

rence Washington fell heir to his father's iron interests. Not long after the death of Lawrence in 1752, the company abandoned the Accokeek Furnace. By this time the company owned the Principio Furnace and Forge, North East Forge, Kingsbury Furnace and Lancashire Furnace, all in Maryland. Though changes occurred from time to time in the partnership through death and the sale of interests, the company remained intact until the Revolution. In 1780 when Maryland confiscated British property within the state, the existence of the company came to an end. The Washington interests as well as those of Thomas Russell were not affected, since they were loyal to the American cause.

[James M. Swank, *History of the Manufacture of Iron in All Ages*; Henry Whitely, *The Principio Company, Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, Vol. XI.]

ARTHUR C. BINING

Printers, Tramp, arose early in the 19th century from an excess of cheap apprentices, usually farm boys indentured in the shops of rural weeklies, who quickly fled to larger towns already overcrowded with printers. Many, forced to seek work from town to town, found the wandering journeyman's comfortless life a pleasantly irresponsible mode of existence. As the country expanded itinerancy grew, acquired tradition, legend and customs that made the "roadster's" path easier. After seeing a large part of the country in his younger days, especially the raw, opening West, the habitual wanderer settled into a summer round in a chosen territory.

His chief mode of transportation was the railroad box car. Inveterates considered it disgraceful to pay fare; and many refused work so long as money for food and drink could be "pan-handled" from craft brothers holding steady situations. Nearly all tramps were devotees of the nickel bars and their free-lunch counters. On their travels they became seedy, and, as age overtook them, stooped, bleary-eyed, a prey to the periodical carouse.

Tolerant conditions reached an apogee in the late 1880's. Thenceforward, as the small, inefficient printshops of the handset days gave way before composing machines and mass production, the tramps were restricted to the more remote, laggard shops. The tottering remnants disappeared only with the onset of depression in the 1930's.

GENE GEER

Printer's Devil. Upon the introduction of printing in some European cities it was associated with "black magic," because of the marvelous uniformity of printed works as compared with manuscripts. This "mystery" was cherished

by printers, who then dubbed their young helpers, blackened with ink, evil spirits or "devils." Some European apprentices, too, were considered menials with no hope of advancement, and so received a disreputable name. In America the chore boy or youngest apprentice was called the "printer's devil," but the term had lost some of its evil import. Here he could follow the example of Franklin and become a master, publisher or writer. He learned to set type, to assist at the hand press, and so obtained a kind of education. His school was the printing office, which boasted of such graduates as Horace Greeley and Thurlow Weed. With the mechanization of printing⁹⁷, however, apprenticeship declined and the "printer's devil" became obsolete.

[W. W. Pasko, *American Dictionary of Printing and Book-making*; D. B. Updike, *The History, Forms and Uses of Printing Types*.]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Printing, Government. The earliest printers in colonial America were often engaged in printing for the provincial authorities. Proclamations, legal forms and paper money⁹⁸ were the source of lucrative employment; and later, printers coveted governmental contracts. During the Revolution the need for a printer was felt, and in 1777 Congress sought to have a press set up in Yorktown. Under the Constitution the secretary of the Senate and the clerk of the House were empowered to let contracts for the printing of their journals. Some difficulty was encountered when the capital was transferred to Washington in 1801, where printing establishments were not readily available; but expenditure for printing was still a minor item, the necessity for which was challenged in 1803 when the printing of Jefferson's messages was proposed.

In 1819 Congress provided for the election of a printer by both houses. Gales and Seaton of the *National Intelligencer*⁹⁹ were chosen, and henceforth the public printing became a political plum. The scandalous excesses discovered in the operation of this system led in 1852 to the appointment of a Superintendent of Public Printing who supervised the work let to printing contractors. This office in turn became the source of political graft. The contract system having proved a failure, the Government in 1860 purchased a plant to do its own printing.

In 1895 laws relating to public printing were codified, and centralization in the Government Printing Office was provided. With the most modern mechanical equipment in all branches, this has become the largest publishing concern in America. It has an enormous output of all kinds of printed matter, in addition to the con-

gressional printing. More than 5500 persons were employed in 1936 under the direction of the Public Printer, who is appointed by the President. In 1922 an apprentice school was established for training in the trades; and by an act of 1924 collective bargaining with employees over wage scales was introduced.

The separate Bureau of Engraving and Printing was established in 1862 to handle the issue of paper currency and bonds, and was given legislative recognition in 1874. In 1880 the engraving of postage stamps was authorized, but this was still done by private contractors as late as 1895. Revenue stamps, checks and governmental forms are also prepared by the Bureau under the supervision of the Treasury Department. By the third decade of the 20th century between 4000 and 5000 persons were employed in this work, with their operations carefully guarded. Since 1880 a separate building has been provided.

[R. W. Kerr, *History of the Government Printing Office*; L. F. Schmeckebier, *The Government Printing Office*, and *The Bureau of Engraving and Printing*, Service Monographs Nos. 36 and 56.]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Printing in America. Printing was first introduced into the Americas in Mexico City, certainly in 1539 by Juan Pablos and perhaps still earlier by Esteban Martín. These early dates are accounted for by the interest of the church authorities in providing books of devotion for the religious instruction of the Indians. For details of the history of the press in Latin America see *La Imprenta en Mexico*, and other works by José Toribio Medina.

The first press in English-speaking North America was landed late in 1638 and set up early in 1639 in Cambridge, Mass. The press, types, paper and workmen to operate the equipment were brought to this country by Jose Glover, a nonconformist English clergyman who visited the Massachusetts Bay Colony¹⁰⁰ and, deciding to make it his home, returned to England to get his family. Because he believed a printing press would be helpful to the colony and to the newly established Harvard College¹⁰¹, he acquired the printing equipment in England and brought it with him on the return trip.

Glover died on this return trip, but his widow had the press set up by Stephen Day and his two sons, who had been employed in England for this purpose. The first job known to have been printed was the single-sheet Freeman's Oath; the second an almanac for 1639. No copies of either are known to have survived. The third product of the press was a consequential volume of local

authorship as well as printing, *The Whole Booke of Psalmes*, which was newly translated from the Hebrew by the local Cambridge divines. This ambitious volume appeared in 1640 and constitutes the earliest extant product of the press in what is now the United States.

The books and pamphlets produced by the earliest Massachusetts printers were religious in character. The crowning achievement of the early Cambridge press was the printing of the entire text of the Bible translated into the Massachusetts Indian language by Rev. John Eliot (see "Indian Bible," Eliot's). This book was completed in 1663, being printed by Samuel Green and Marmaduke Johnson.

In 1682 William Nuthead set up a press in Virginia and began to print, but the colonial governor, Sir William Berkeley, promptly suppressed the enterprise before Nuthead's first publication was completed. The printer then moved to Maryland, where he is known to have printed at least as early as 1685, and probably earlier.

Pennsylvania was the third colony to have a press, William Bradford setting up a printing office in Philadelphia in 1685. Wearied by interference by the religious and civil authorities, he moved in 1693 to New York, becoming the first printer in that city and colony.

From this point onward the most important products of the early presses became colonial laws, gubernatorial proclamations and other public documents. Connecticut's first laws were sent to Massachusetts to be printed, but in 1709 the colony secured its first press, set up at New London by Thomas Short.

Demand for the printing of laws and documents was responsible for the establishment of presses in South Carolina in 1731, in North Carolina in 1749 and in Georgia in 1763. The French king granted exclusive license to print in his American colony of Louisiana to Denis Braud, whose first duty was the melancholy one of printing in 1764 the notice of the transfer of that colony to Spanish sovereignty (see Fontainebleau, Treaty of).

In the latter half of the 18th century the initial function of a printer was usually the production of a newspaper. Thus it was in New Hampshire in 1756, in Georgia in 1763, in Florida in 1783, in what is now the District of Columbia in 1789 (see Newspapers, Colonial).

The westward migration of the printing press is told in the article on Newspapers²⁷. Where the dates of the first presses were far in advance of normal settlement, or of settlement accelerated by the discovery of gold or other metals, we find that evangelistic zeal was responsible for their

establishment. Thus the young Baptist missionary Jotham Meeker took a press to Kansas in 1834 to educate and convert the Indians. Printing began at Union, now in Oklahoma, in 1835, to provide for the spiritual and educational needs of the transplanted Cherokee Indians, and devoted missionaries set up a press in 1839 in what is now Idaho (see Lapwai Mission) to evangelize the Nez Percés.

The establishment of governmental functions in newly formed territories was the other important influence responsible for the spread of the press throughout the Middle West.

The following schedule gives the dates of the first printing in each state, and the name of the first printer, in accordance with the present state of knowledge on this subject:

ALABAMA

1807: [Wakefield] "On the Mobile." Printer unidentified

ARIZONA

1859: Tubac: Jack Sims and George Smithson (?)

ARKANSAS

1819: Arkansas Post: William Edward Woodruff

CALIFORNIA

1834: Monterey: Agustin V. Zamorano (minor printing at earlier dates)

COLORADO

1859: Denver ("Cherry Creek"): William Newton Byers

CONNECTICUT

1709: New London: Thomas Short

DELAWARE

1761: Wilmington: James Adams

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1789: Georgetown: Charles Fierier

FLORIDA

1783: Saint Augustine: John and William Charles Wells

GEORGIA

1763: Savannah: James Johnston

IDAHO

1839: Lapwai: Edwin O. Hall

ILLINOIS

1814: Kaskaskia: Matthew Duncan

INDIANA

1804: Vincennes: Elihu Stout

IOWA

1836: Dubuque: John King and William Carey Jones

KANSAS

1834: Shawanoe Mission: Jotham Meeker

KENTUCKY

1787: Lexington: John and Fielding Bradford

346 Printing in America

- LOUISIANA
1764: New Orleans: Denis Braud
- MAINE
1785: Falmouth: Benjamin Titcomb and Thomas Baker Wait
- MARYLAND
1685: Saint Marys: William Nuthead
- MASSACHUSETTS
1639: Cambridge: Stephen Day
- MICHIGAN
1796: Detroit: John McCall
- MINNESOTA
1849: Saint Paul: James M. Goodhue
- MISSISSIPPI
1798?: Walnut Hills: Andrew Marschalk
- MISSOURI
1808: Saint Louis: Joseph Charless
- MONTANA
1863: Virginia City: Daniel W. Tilton
- NEBRASKA
1847: [Omaha]: Unidentified Mormon printer
- NEVADA
1858: Genoa: William L. Jernegan and Alfred James
- NEW HAMPSHIRE
1756: Portsmouth: Daniel Fowle
- NEW JERSEY
1723?: Perth Amboy?: William Bradford
- NEW MEXICO
1834: Santa Fé: Jesús María Baca
- NEW YORK
1693: New York City: William Bradford
- NORTH CAROLINA
1749: New Bern: James Davis
- NORTH DAKOTA
1864: Fort Union: S. C. Winegar and ——— Goodwin
- OHIO
1793: Cincinnati: William Maxwell
- OKLAHOMA
1835: Union: John F. Wheeler
- OREGON
1846: Oregon City: Oregon Printing Association (John Fleming, printer)
- PENNSYLVANIA
1685: Philadelphia: William Bradford
- RHODE ISLAND
1727: Newport: James Franklin
- SOUTH CAROLINA
1731: Charleston: George Webb
- SOUTH DAKOTA
1858: Sioux Falls: Samuel J. Albright
- TENNESSEE
1791: Rogersville: George Roulstone and Robert Ferguson
- TEXAS
1817: Galveston: Samuel Bangs

Printing Press, Early American

- UTAH
1849: Salt Lake City: Brigham H. Young
- VERMONT
1781: Westminster: Judah Padock Spooner and Timothy Green
- VIRGINIA
1682: Jamestown: William Nuthead
- WASHINGTON
1852: Olympia: James W. Wiley and Thornton F. McElroy
- WEST VIRGINIA
1790: Shepherdstown: Nathaniel Willis
- WISCONSIN
1833: Green Bay: Albert G. Ellis and John V. Suydam
- WYOMING
1863: Fort Bridger: Hiram Brundage

[Douglas C. McMurtrie, *A History of Printing in the U. S.*, and *The Book: The Story of Printing and Bookmaking*; Lawrence C. Wroth, *The Colonial Printer*.]

DOUGLAS C. MCMURTRIE

Printing Press, Early American. For over 100 years printing in America was on presses imported from Europe. Then in 1750 Christopher Sower of Germantown, Pa., contrived a press for himself, but American manufacture did not begin until 1769 when Isaac Doolittle, a clock-maker of New Haven, Conn., built a press for William Goddard of Philadelphia. About 1800, however, Adam Ramage, a Scotsman, began to manufacture in Philadelphia the presses which bore his name. All of these presses were of the primitive plan, operated by a hand lever which applied pressure to the platen by a central screw, held in a framework of wood. Ramage improved the press, enlarged the screw and used more metal parts. He adapted or copied European innovations, and carried on an extensive manufacture. In 1813 George Clymer made his Columbian press which substituted direct leverage for the screw; and Otis Tuft used a toggle joint in place of the screw. Other press makers were John I. Wells of Hartford, and Samuel Rust and Peter Smith of New York. The latter brought out the Washington hand press, but sold the patent in 1825 to R. Hoe and Company. The power press was then coming into use, but these hand presses were used in smaller offices for many years.

The first regular manufacture of type in America was by Abel Buell of Killingworth, Conn., whose foundry was aided by the Connecticut assembly, although various printers had made sorts before this time. German type was cast in 1770 by Christopher Sower, Jr., of Germantown. That of Binny and Ronaldson of Philadelphia in

1796 was the first extensive typefoundry in America.

[L. C. Wroth, *The Colonial Printer*; Thomas Mackellar, *The American Printer*; D. B. Updike, *The History, Forms, and Uses of Printing Types*.]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Prison Camps, Northern, in Civil War. During the first months of the Civil War, most prisoners were released on parole, but officers captured were confined in Forts Warren, Lafayette, McHenry, on Governors Island, at Camp Chase⁹⁰, Ohio, at McDowell's College in St. Louis and the penitentiary at Alton, Ill. This proving unsatisfactory, in October, 1861, Lt. Col. W. H. Hoffman was appointed Commissary General of Prisoners, and began preparations of a prison camp at Johnson's Island in Lake Erie. The fall of Fort Donelson⁹¹ gave the North more prisoners than could be cared for on the island, and only officers were sent there. Enlisted men were confined at Camps Douglas⁹² in Chicago, Butler⁹³ in Springfield, Morton at Indianapolis, Randall at Madison, and Chase at Columbus. Except Camp Randall, these former training camps became more or less permanent prisons. In addition, before the war closed, camps were established at Elmira, N. Y., Point Lookout, Md., Fort Delaware, and Rock Island, Ill. Prisoners were confined in barracks, closely guarded, and given regulation army rations. Savings from rations went into a camp fund to supply books, entertainment and hospital facilities. Although Southerners attempted to circulate atrocity stories about conditions in the prisons there were no unusual hardships imposed until 1863 when Secretary Stanton ordered reduction in rations until Northern prisoners were receiving "Precisely similar treatment . . . in respect to food, clothing, medical treatment, and other necessities" to that accorded Union prisoners held by the South. Under the regime of retaliation, disease and death increased in Northern prison camps until the total casualties approximated those in Southern prisons. In the last months of the war an agreement was made for each side to supply its soldiers in the enemy prison camps. Shipments of cotton to the North enabled the Confederates to furnish rations and clothing to Northern prisoners.

[W. B. Hesseltine, *Civil War Prisons*.]

W. B. HESSELTINE

Prison Industries. The punitive values of hard labor have been abandoned by most prisons⁹⁴ in favor of various forms of productive employment and industrial training. Several handicrafts appeared in the early penitentiaries and

long persisted in the large cells of the Pennsylvania prison system⁹⁵. But pioneer factory owners were quick to bid for the prisons' steady labor supply. The first contract was let in 1803, and labor agitation appeared to oppose the system as early as 1823. Many prisons defrayed all expenses from such earnings during the years before the Civil War, and the dictates of economy continued to block effective anticontract legislation until the mid-1880's. Then many state politicians granted anticontract laws as a concession to labor, and the prison officials took over the management of the industries, marketing the products through private firms under piece-price contracts. Labor finally became strong enough during the 1890's to prohibit the sale of convict-made goods in a few states, and there the state-use system was evolved. A few prisons developed state-account systems, producing articles for growing markets within their areas, as binder twine in the grain belt. The lease system, dominant in the South during Reconstruction years, was replaced during the 1890's by farm and road camps or by prisons operated in conjunction with lucrative contract industries. Many nonindustrial states have continued favorable contracts with firms that market their cheap goods, notably shoes and clothing, throughout the country. In 1929 labor secured the passage of the Federal Hawes-Cooper Act, effective in 1934, granting states the authority to prohibit the sale of convict-made goods from other states if enforced against their own prisons. The Ashurst-Sumners Act of 1935 added Federal regulations and penalties for the enforcement of this measure. A code authority, organized for prison industries under the National Recovery Administration⁹⁶, was reorganized as the Prison Industries Reorganization Administration in 1935 and now assists state officials to plan prison manufactures, chiefly for state use.

[Gustav Peck, *The Prison Labor Problem*, in *Monthly Labor Review*, November, 1936; Prison Industries Reorganization Administration, *Progress Report*, 1937; Blake McKelvey, *American Prisons*.]

BLAKE MCKELVEY

Prison-ships were used by both Americans and British during the Revolution for confining naval prisoners. The former maintained such ships at Boston and New London, and the latter at Halifax, Antigua, and at Wallabout Bay, Brooklyn. Conditions varied greatly according to the character of the officers and subordinates in charge, but the ships moored in Wallabout Bay, particularly the *Jersey*⁹⁷, became notorious for the harsh treatment accorded the captives. Provisions were scanty, of bad quality and poor-

ly cooked. Fever and dysentery prevailed, the guards were brutal, and at night the prisoners, both able-bodied and sick, were herded below decks in intolerable heat and stench. Both Washington and the Continental Congress⁹⁹ protested against this treatment, and Vice-Admiral John Byron, Royal Navy, labored hard to better conditions. At least thirteen different prison-ships were moored in Wallabout Bay or in the East or North rivers from 1776 to 1783. It has been estimated that some 11,500 men died on these ships.

[Thomas Dring, *Recollections of the Jersey Prison-ship*; E. L. Armbruster, *The Wallabout Prison Ships, 1776-1783*; G. W. Allen, *A Naval History of the American Revolution*.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Prisoners, Exchange of. See Exchange of Prisoners.

Prisoners of War. Although in ancient times captives taken in combat were slaughtered or held in permanent slavery, the enlightened 18th century, with its perfection of courteous military professionalism, influenced by Montesquieu and Rousseau, marked the official recognition of humane treatment of prisoners of war. Landmarks in this respect were the treaty negotiated in 1785 by Benjamin Franklin with Prussia⁹⁹, and the U. S. Army regulations issued in 1863 (see Civil War: General Orders No. 100), followed by many nations in treaties at Brussels in 1874 and The Hague⁹⁹ in 1899.

During the Revolution, Great Britain at first hesitated to treat as prisoners of war, subject to parole and exchange, "rebels" and "traitors" like Ethan Allen and Gen. Charles Lee. However, exchanges were occasionally effected beginning as early as April 28, 1775. Later the humane character of Sir William Howe developed parole and exchange into a practice. Many Germans paroled as captives from British mercenaries settled permanently in the colonies. During the Civil War, the Union extended the "privilege" of "prisoner of war" treatment to Confederate "rebel" captives.

Inadequate facilities, faulty organization and isolated personal brutality, more than official intention, made New York City during the Revolution and some Civil War stockades and forts into hell holes of starvation, exposure and cruelty (see Prison-ships; Confederate Prisons; Prison Camps, Northern).

The Civil War was the last American conflict which saw wholesale exchanges of prisoners. During the last two years of that struggle, and during the World War, the system disappeared. Attrition had become a recognized combat method

and prisoners were no longer exchanged unless incapacitated for service. Military personnel, and civilians too, were held in concentration camps. Except in instances, as in the Revolutionary and Civil wars, they were housed, fairly treated, allowed limited communication home and sometimes paid when put to work.

[H. C. Fooks, *Prisoners of War*.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Prisons and Prison Reform. Cesare Beccaria, an 18th-century Italian rationalist, started the movement for the substitution of imprisonment for corporal and capital punishments. Religious and humanitarian influences rallied to the cause, dedicating the first prisons to the ends of isolation and penance. Philadelphia, in 1791, was the first to establish a penitentiary in America—in a separate wing of the Walnut Street jail. However, this prison and the half-dozen others established in neighboring states were quickly overcrowded and degenerated into congregate schools of crime.

These conditions inspired the first prison reform movement. The 1820's and 1830's saw the development of the rival Auburn and Pennsylvania prison systems⁹⁹, as well as the first houses of correction and reform schools. Slowly the larger urban centers provided for their misdemeanants and juveniles in the latter institutions, but the states could not dodge the necessity of erecting larger and more secure prisons for their growing convict populations. The preference enjoyed by the Auburn system—because of its low cost and the promise of large returns from contract labor—was enhanced by the endorsement of Lewis Dwight and his Boston Prison Discipline Society (1824-54). By the middle of the 19th century prisons of this type had been erected by all the states, with the exception of New Jersey and Pennsylvania where the solitary system prevailed.

Meanwhile, theories of positive reformatory aids were voiced by the New York Prison Association and developed in reform schools and houses of correction. In the mid-1860's Enoch Cobb Wines, secretary of the New York Association, led a new reform movement. The American Prison Association was organized in 1870, pledged to the development of prisons as correctional institutions and to the substitution of reformatory for time sentences.

A new penological model was developed by Zebulon Brockway in Elmira (N. Y.) Reformatory, opened in 1876. Its young men were received as first offenders with indeterminate sentences, and Brockway assumed the responsibility of deciding the date of their reformation and

conditional release. His complex grading and marking system, combined with academic and industrial instruction, and later with military training, provided the young convict with the means as well as the incentive to win his parole. Before the close of the century the forms of the system had been widely copied, and parole or indeterminate sentence laws had been adopted in twenty-five states. Unfortunately, few prison officers had the training or ability to administer this intricate system. The increasing congestion of the prisons, and the unemployment made necessary by anticontract laws, combined to frustrate much of the work of the reformatory era.

In recent years criminologists have tested mental and emotional reactions and social backgrounds of prisoners, and it now appears that the major fallacy of the reformatory was its assumption that all convicts could profit from its standard regimen. The classification of criminals has become the keynote of modern penology. Maximum security prisons retain the confirmed criminal as long as the law will allow. Criminals not likely to attempt breaks are housed in medium security prisons, where they may labor for their own support, if the state law permits, and may be conditionally released at the discretion of the parole board. Likely prospects for reform are housed in minimum security institutions or industrial farms⁷⁰ where they learn some productive occupation and prepare for early parole. The parole system⁷¹ and the newer probation system have now become integral parts of the correctional program.

[Sanford Bates, *Prisons and Beyond; Handbook of American Prisons and Reformatories*; Blake McKelvey, *American Prisons*.]

BLAKE MCKELVEY

Privateers and Privateering. While the operations of Hawkins, Drake and other Elizabethan freebooters is often taken as the starting point in the history of privateering in America, the private-armed participation of American colonists in the wars of England practically began with King William's War⁷² (1689-97). During Queen Anne's War⁷³ (1702-13) a considerable number of privateers were commissioned by the colonial governors, but relatively few took to the sea during the short war with Spain in 1718. Under royal warrants the American governors in 1739 again issued letters of marque and reprisal⁷⁴ against Spain. In King George's War⁷⁵ (1744-48) privateering began to assume the proportions of a major maritime business; and it is said that during the French and Indian War⁷⁶ (1754-63) 11,000 Americans were engaged in private-armed operations.

Upon the commencement of hostilities with the mother country in 1775, most of the colonies, notably Massachusetts and Rhode Island, issued letters of marque and reprisal; and the Continental Congress⁷⁷ three months before the Declaration of Independence sanctioned privateering "against the enemies of the United Colonies." The 1151 privateers of the Revolution captured about 600 British vessels, of which 16 were men-of-war. During the last three years of the war, the privateers carried the brunt of sea operations. By 1781 there were in commission only three public cruisers (*see* Revolution, The Navy in), but 449 private-armed cruisers mounting 6735 guns were in service. Although the operations of the privateers had been not only financially profitable but also an invaluable aid to the navy, the Government soon joined the sentimental movement in Europe for the abolition of privateering, but abandoned it in 1798 in the face of the arrogant depredations of armed vessels sailing under the authority of republican France (*see* Franco-American Misunderstanding). The Congress met the issue first (act of June 25) by allowing American merchantmen⁷⁸ to arm themselves for defensive purposes, and then (act of July 9) by authorizing them to apply for special commissions to make offensive war on all armed French vessels. By the close of 1798, at least 428 merchantmen had been armed, probably three fourths of which had received official commissions; and before the close of hostilities in 1801, upward of 1000 vessels had been armed. As the armed merchantmen were not allowed to prey on unarmed commerce, fighting was generally secondary to trading; nevertheless, there were some notable encounters and valuable captures. In the War of 1812, 515 letters of marque and reprisal were issued, under which 1345 British vessels are known to have been taken. While all the seaboard states from Maine to Louisiana sent privateers to sea against England in one or both of these wars, Massachusetts led with a total of at least 457, Maryland followed with 281, and New Jersey and North Carolina closed the column with probably not more than four each.

With the return of world peace in 1815, many American and European privateers were unwilling to return to peaceful pursuits; some took service in Latin-American revolutions, and others became pirates. For the next twenty-five years the United States Navy was much engaged in the suppression of piracy⁷⁹. The Republic of Texas⁸⁰ resorted to privateering in the early stage (1835-37) of its protracted war with Mexico. The United States with its naval superiority did not

find it expedient to issue letters of marque and reprisal during the Mexican War⁹⁰. The United States declined to accede to the Declaration of Paris⁹¹ (1856), outlawing privateering among the principal world powers; but when the Confederate States⁹² issued letters of marque, Lincoln endeavored to treat the Confederate privateersmen as pirates until he was checked by retaliatory measures. The privateersmen sailing from Louisiana and the two Carolinas in 1861 enjoyed as profitable cruises as their brothers of 1812; but Confederate privateering declined after the first year, and a volunteer naval system was instituted (*see* Confederate Navy). The United States' attempt at privateering in 1863 proved abortive, likewise Chile's attempt against Spain in 1865; and privateering ended throughout the world with the downfall of the Confederacy.

[C. W. Kendall, *Private Men-of-War*; E. S. Maclay, *A History of American Privateers*; Navy Department, *Quasi-War with France*; W. M. Robinson, Jr., *The Sea Dogs of Texas*, and *The Confederate Privateers*.]

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

Privilege in Colonial Governments comprises that body of rights and exemptions claimed by colonial legislatures in imitation of the British House of Commons. Sometimes privilege was claimed by virtue of charters⁹³, sometimes by inherent natural right, but usually existed in practice by demand of the assembly with consent of the governor. As with Parliament itself, its exact extent cannot be measured because it was constantly changing. The five privileges usually petitioned for by the Speaker of the House in England, i.e., freedom from arrest, from molestation, freedom of speech, access to the crown and favorable construction on all official acts of the house, had, with the exception of New England, become practically universal in the colonies in the 18th century. By interpretation many offenses against members came to be included under privilege. It was further expanded by extension to three classes of persons in addition to members, servants of members, officers of the house and people who had given evidence. Privilege gradually extended also to settle disputed elections, to control members and to punish outsiders who abused individual members or insulted the house itself.

The practical efficacy of these claims to privilege are apparent, for by them the assemblies tried to regulate the extent of the governor's power over them, as Parliament had that of the king. Many claims, such as the prorogation and dissolution of the assemblies, establishment of new districts of representation, house control of

election of speaker and of veto, were denied to the colonies by England, even though Parliament had won them over the king. Down to the Revolution such denials, however, were not accepted by the colonies as final, and the struggle to obtain them caused many a conflict between governor and assembly, made more acute by the fact that the house in last analysis held the whip hand because it controlled the purse strings. By its authority taxes were levied, appropriations for expenses made and often arrangements for spending. Many a governor had to choose between making concessions and receiving no salary. It can, therefore, be seen that parliamentary privilege was considered the very essence of representative government, because by it the balance of power in the colonial assemblies⁹⁴ could be kept with the people through their representatives rather than with the governor who represented prerogative interests.

Parliament as well as king disapproved of the independent position of colonial assemblies achieved by claims to privilege, because it was incompatible with the theory that Parliament was the supreme legislative body for the Empire and that the assemblies were subordinate to it. However, as long as the assemblies were in practice in the position of equality with the House of Commons on money matters by taxing themselves, conflicts over privilege did not jeopardize the Empire, but when in 1765 England denied their claims to be taxed only in their assemblies, she brought to a crisis the long-standing larger issue of the relationship of the colonial assemblies to Parliament.

[*Essays in Colonial History*, presented to Charles McLean Andrews.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

Privileged Class. In America the word privilege has come to mean special favor of birth, fortune or legislation. Legislative favor has always been invoked according to circumstances of time or group. In colonial days, when land was the chief form of wealth, privilege came to those who could secure large grants from royal governors or even the legislatures of godly commonwealths like Connecticut. With growth of manufactures privilege took the form of tariffs. With lumbering, railroads, mining (especially silver) it assumed new forms. It is a mistake, however, to consider only the few or wealthy as forming privileged groups. The farmers have their subsidies (*see* Farm Relief); the veterans of all wars their pension and bonus⁹⁵ grabs. Almost the only unprivileged group, as far as the government trough is concerned, are those ordinary citizens described by Sumner in his *Forgotten Man*⁹⁶.

Attempts to abolish privilege have taken various forms, such as abolition of primogeniture, entail and titles; antitrust laws; graduated income and inheritance taxes; and "share the wealth" schemes⁹⁹. There would seem, nevertheless, to be an increasing rather than a decreasing desire for privilege among most Americans, and there is little general or genuine wish to abolish it in the form of private property, inheritance or even legislative favor, the reason being that each hopes to get something for himself. (*See also* Pressure Groups.)

[For the beginnings, *see* J. T. Adams, *Provincial Society*.]

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

Privileges and Immunities of Citizens. In the United States Constitution there are two privileges and immunities clauses, the interstate privileges and immunities clause in Article IV and the United States privileges and immunities clause in the Fourteenth Amendment¹⁰⁰.

The Supreme Court has made the interstate privileges and immunities clause require every state to give to all the citizens except corporations (but not residents) of other states all the privileges and immunities which it gives to its own citizens. It does not have to give its own citizens the privileges and immunities which other states give their citizens. The Supreme Court has also made the words privileges and immunities include not only civil privileges and immunities but civil rights and powers. Therefore, the result is that whatever civil rights, powers, privileges and immunities a state gives to its own citizens the same, neither more nor less, it must give to the citizens of each of the other states.

The privileges and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment¹⁰¹ forbids any state from abridging "the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States" whether by birth or naturalization. In the case of this clause the Supreme Court, unless the case of *Colgate v. Harvey* has changed the rule, has given a narrow meaning to the words privileges and immunities, so that they include only those privileges and immunities which a citizen of the United States has because of his peculiar relation to the United States, such as access to the seat of Government and to the seaports, protection on the high seas, peaceable assemblage, petitioning the Government for redress of grievances, the writ of habeas corpus¹⁰², the use of navigable waters, state citizenship by residence, immunity from slavery, and the right of due process¹⁰³. Neither suffrage nor the privilege of jury service is a privilege of United States citizenship. This constitutional

law was established by the Supreme Court in the *Slaughter-House Cases*¹⁰⁴ by a five to four vote. In the case of *Colgate v. Harvey*, the Court took the view of the dissenting judges in the *Slaughter-House Cases* and held that it was a privilege of United States citizenship to acquire, own and receive income from investments outside of one's state, which made this clause practically as broad as the interstate privileges and immunities clause and the due process clause.

[H. E. Willis, *Constitutional Law of the United States*.]

HUGH E. WILLIS

Privy Council, THE. In the performance of its duties the English crown acted on the advice of the Privy Council, which, at the time English colonization began in America in the 17th century, filled a place roughly corresponding to that filled now by the cabinet. This body of royal councillors contained all of the ministers of state, who held leading positions in administration. Its sphere of activity was approximately co-extensive with all the Empire, and, as colonies grew up, they fell, naturally, under the special care of the council. The duty of hearing appeals from colonial courts¹⁰⁵, together with receiving colonial laws referred to it for approval or veto (*see* Royal Disallowance), became the duty of the council. And, successive bodies formed for the oversight of the colonies, culminating in the Board of Trade and Plantations¹⁰⁶ of 1696, were either committees of the Privy Council, or boards acting under its control and reporting to it.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, Vol. I.]

FRANK B. HURT

Prize Cases (1863). During the Civil War the Supreme Court upheld President Lincoln's exercise of emergency powers without previous authorization from Congress. After the firing on Fort Sumter¹⁰⁷, Lincoln, by executive proclamations (in April and May, 1861), had virtually declared war, called for volunteers, enlarged the regular army, suspended the writ of habeas corpus¹⁰⁸, and blockaded various Southern ports; and not until July did Congress, meeting in special session, retroactively legalize these executive measures. Meanwhile, under the presidential blockade certain merchant vessels were captured as prizes by the Union Navy for attempting to run the blockade, and the cases were appealed. Eventually in 1863 the Supreme Court held in a narrow five to four decision that Lincoln's blockade by executive proclamation was constitutional and that civil war had "legally" existed between April and July, 1861, even though Congress did not recognize a state of war until

the act of July 13, 1861. (See also *Amy Warwick Admiralty Case*.)

[J. G. Randall, *Constitutional Problems under Lincoln*.]

MARTIN P. CLAUSSEN

Prize Courts are national courts set up by a belligerent⁹⁷ state to pass upon the capture of enemy or neutral merchant vessels and goods, and to determine their liability to confiscation. Although the jurisdiction of prize courts is derived from the national legislation which creates them, the rules they apply to the cases coming before them are theoretically the rules of international law⁹⁸. The fact, however, that the separate national prize courts frequently put their own interpretation upon the rules of international law has given rise to conflicting decisions, chiefly in respect to the nature of contraband goods and the scope and effectiveness of blockades⁹⁹. In the United States jurisdiction over prizes is exercised by the Federal courts sitting as courts of admiralty¹⁰⁰.

Owing to the numerous controversies between belligerent and neutral states arising from the decisions of belligerent prize courts adverse to the claims of neutral merchant vessels both upon points of law and upon points of fact, proposals were made on various occasions for the creation in time of war of prize courts upon which neutral states as well as belligerents would be represented. These proposals culminated in the adoption by the Hague Conference¹⁰¹ of 1907 of the Convention Relative to the Establishment of an International Prize Court, which provided that, while national courts should continue to exercise jurisdiction over prize cases, an appeal might be taken in all cases involving the property of neutrals and in certain cases involving enemy property. The law to be applied by the court was, in the absence of treaty provisions, to be "the rules of international law." If no generally recognized rule existed, the court was to give judgment "in accordance with the general principles of justice and equity." The composition of the court was the result of a compromise between the claims of the smaller states to equal representation and the obvious impossibility of a court representing the entire body of states. Judges and deputy judges were to be appointed by each state, and from among these a court of fifteen judges was to be set up, eight of whom, representing the Great Powers, were to be permanent members. The other seven were to be occasional members sitting by rotation according to a table annexed to the convention, which gave a longer or shorter term to different states according to the rank assigned to them. This practical denial of the prin-

ciple of the equality of states led to the refusal of a number of states, notably Brazil, to sign the convention, while eleven other states signed with reservation of the offending article. Ratification of the convention was delayed pending a more definite understanding of the law to be applied by the court; and it was for this purpose that the London Naval Conference was called, which resulted in the signing of the Declaration of London¹⁰². In its turn, however, the Declaration of London failed of ratification, so that upon the outbreak of the World War the proposed International Prize Court had not yet come into being.

[C. C. Hyde, *International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States*.]

C. G. FENWICK

Prize Fights were held early in the 19th century in the United States but in the days of bare-knuckle pugilism they never won the popular support accorded them in England. "We are not yet fashionable enough," *Niles' Register*¹⁰³ commented sarcastically in 1823, "for such things . . ." They were illegal in every state, such fights as were held being put on secretly to avoid police interference, and they were attended only by small numbers of "the fancy." Not until after adoption of the Queensberry Rules (1866) and introduction of gloves—the transformation of pugilism into boxing—did prize fighting come into its own. Nevertheless, there was wide interest in some of the champions of the 1840's and 1850's—Tom Hyer, "Yankee Sullivan," John Morrissey and John C. Heenan—and the public read about their fights even if it did not attend them. The last named pugilist, known as "Benicia Boy," fought one of the most memorable fights on record when he challenged the English champion, Tom Sayers, in 1860.

The last of the great bare-knuckle championship fights in this country took place in 1889 when

Nigh New Orleans
Upon an emerald plain
John L. Sullivan
The Strong Boy
Of Boston
Fought seventy-five red rounds with
Jake Kilrain.

Three years later the passing of the old order was signalized when, fighting under the Queensberry Rules and wearing five-ounce gloves, the great John L. went down to defeat before the fierce attack of "Gentleman" Jim Corbett, knocked out in the twenty-first round before 8000 people.

The booming days of prize fighting now set

in: the period marked by such champions as James J. Jeffries, Tommy Burns, Jack Johnson, Jess Willard, Jack Dempsey and Gene Tunney, but it was the inspired showmanship of Tex Rickard which made prize fighting into one of the country's most popular spectator sports. Staging the fights he promoted in huge, open air arenas where the spectators could be assured of an adequate view of the boxing and where order could be maintained at the close of the bout, putting up large money purses based on a share of the gate receipts, and employing every device of publicity to increase interest in the championship, Rickard drew in thousands of cash customers and began to collect gate receipts reckoned in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. While the Johnson-Jeffries fight at Reno, Nev., in 1910 brought in the unheard of total of \$270,755, eleven years later Dempsey and Carpentier fought before a crowd at Jersey City which paid \$1,626,580 for the privilege of watching them. Even this fantastic figure was exceeded when Dempsey and Tunney broke all records with a gate of \$2,750,000 at their second meeting at Chicago, in 1927. The winner profited to the extent of almost \$1,000,000—or forty times the purse won by Corbett in dethroning the "Strong Boy" of Boston. Tunney's retirement from the ring in 1928 was responsible for a marked decline in prize fighting, despite the efforts of promoters to whip up popular enthusiasm, but the rise of Joe Louis a decade later brought about a revival of interest.

[Alexander Johnston, *Ten—and Out!*]

FOSTER RHEA DULLES

Prize Money was derived from the sale of a captured ship or cargo (*see* Prizes). Generally privateers^o received the entire net proceeds, the officers and crew of a warship one half, shared according to pay. Captures in the Revolution and the War of 1812 sometimes were worth \$500,000 and gave the captain \$15,000 and the Negro waiters \$1121. Privateering was abolished by the Declaration of Paris in 1856^o, but Union blockaders earned large amounts during the Civil War. The largest, according to Gideon Welles, was Rear Admiral S. P. Lee's \$150,000. Prize money was finally abolished by Congress on March 3, 1899.

[E. S. Maclay, *History of American Privateers; Diary of Gideon Welles.*]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Prizes. In the Revolution, British commerce, much of it between the West Indies and the mother country, was exposed to attack both by regular American naval vessels and by privateers^o. No figures can be complete, but the Brit-

ish estimated that they lost 3176 vessels during the war, exclusive of warships. This, however, included captures by the French. In the Naval War with France^o the United States captured 85 vessels, and, in the War of 1812^o, 22 naval vessels took 165 prizes, and 492 privateers captured 1344 vessels. An almost equal number was captured by the British, but even such extensive operations had little effect in ending the war. In the Civil War the blockade^o produced about 1400 cases of captured vessels and cargoes, half of which had been valued by the courts up to 1867 at \$25,000,000. Confederate raiders such as the *Florida*, *Alabama* and *Shenandoah*^o did enough damage to Union commerce to secure an award of \$15,500,000 for British violations of neutrality (*see* Alabama Claims).

In the World War the sinkings of Allied and neutral merchantmen by German submarines^o amounted to 11,153,506 gross tons, to which the United States contributed 364,200 gross tons. The gross tonnage of German ships captured by the Allies or taken possession of in port was estimated at 2,392,000.

[D. D. Porter, *The Naval History of the Civil War*; G. W. Allen, *The Naval History of the American Revolution*; A. T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812*; C. E. Fayle, *Seaborne Trade.*]

WALTER B. NORRIS

Proclamation Money (1704-75) was coin valued according to a proclamation of Queen Anne, June 18, 1704, by which the various colonial valuations of the Spanish "pieces of eight,"^o the most common coins in the American colonies, were uniformly fixed at six shillings. This attempt to unify the silver currency of the colonies failed in practice.

[A. McF. Davis, *Currency and Banking in the Province of Massachusetts-Bay*, in *American Economic Association, Publications*, Ser. 3, Vol. 1, No. 4.]

STANLEY R. PILLSBURY

Proclamation of 1763, THE, was prepared in part by Lord Shelburne, president of the Board of Trade^o, but was completed after his resignation by his successor, Lord Hillsborough, and was proclaimed by the crown on Oct. 2. By it parts of the territory in America acquired at the Treaty of Paris^o were organized as the provinces of Quebec, East Florida^o, West Florida^o and Grenada, the laws of England were extended to these provinces, and provision was made for the establishment of general assemblies in them. Settlement within the new provinces was encouraged by grants of land to British veterans of the French and Indian War^o.

The part of the proclamation most significant for American history, however, was that aimed

at conciliating the Indians. The governors of the provinces and colonies were forbidden to grant lands "for the present, and until our further Pleasure be known . . . beyond the Heads or Sources of any of the Rivers which fall into the Atlantic Ocean from the West and North West." An Indian reservation was thus established south of the lands of the Hudson's Bay Company⁷⁰, west of the province of Quebec and the Appalachian Mountains, and north of the line of the Floridas, the 31st parallel. Settlement upon the Indian lands was prohibited, and settlers already upon such lands were commanded "forthwith to remove themselves." Furthermore, private purchases of land from the Indians were forbidden, those that had been made in the Indian reservation were voided, and future purchases were to be made officially, by the governor of the colony involved, for the crown alone. Indian traders⁷¹ were to be licensed and to give security to observe such regulations as might be promulgated.

Though the proclamation was issued hurriedly at the time of Pontiac's War⁷² the sections relating to the Indian lands and Indian trade had been maturely considered. For more than a decade successive ministries had been dissatisfied with the management of Indian relations by the different colonies. The rivalry of the colonies for Indian trade, and in some cases for western lands, had led to abuses by the governors of their power over trade and land grants. Attempting to advance their own interests or those of their respective colonies, they ignored the interests of the Indians and aroused a justified resentment. The success of the French in conciliating the Indians was an argument in favor of a unified system of imperial control of Indian affairs and the restriction of settlement.

The appointment in 1756 of two superintendents of Indian affairs⁷³, for the northern and southern districts, was the first step toward the home government's control of Indian relations. Thereafter the letters of Sir William Johnson, superintendent of the northern Indians, informed the Board of Trade of Indian grievances and urged the fixing of a line west of which settlement should be prohibited. The danger from the Indians during the French and Indian War automatically fixed such a line at the Appalachian Mountains, and after the war proclamations by the military authorities continued this line. Settlers, however, disregarding the proclamations, swarmed over the mountains, and their encroachments were one of the causes of Pontiac's War. The proclamation of 1763 was an attempt to check the advance of settlement

until some agreement securing the Indians' consent to such settlement could be made. It fixed the line temporarily at the watershed—a conspicuous landmark—but did not and was not intended to change the boundaries of the old colonies; nevertheless, it was resented in the colonies as an interference in their affairs. After Pontiac's War, negotiations with the Indians resulted in the treaties of Hard Labor, Fort Stanwix and Lochaber⁷⁴, by which a new line, more acceptable to the colonists, was drawn; and in 1774 the Quebec Act⁷⁵ added the remainder of the reservation north of the Ohio to the province of Quebec.

[C. W. Alvord, *Mississippi Valley in British Politics.*]
 SOLON J. BUCK

Proclamations, American. A proclamation is defined as an official or general notice to the public. Such notices are issued by American political executives for purposes connected with the actual conduct of government, and for ceremonial purposes. In connection with the former, proclamations are always issued by the President or the governor when an emergency situation requires the establishment of a state of martial law, as in the case of Lincoln's Proclamation of 1861, or many issued by governors in instances of strike violence; when it is necessary to order a movement of troops into a troubled or afflicted area, to protect life and property and maintain order, without martial law, as in some strike situations; or when a sudden turn of events requires action on the part of the executive, as in the case of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, or the Proclamation of Amnesty of 1865, Wilson's Armistice Proclamation of 1918, or Roosevelt's Bank Holiday Proclamation of 1933⁷⁶.

On the ceremonial side, certain days are established by act of the legislature in each state as legal holidays. In some cases, such as Thanksgiving⁷⁷, it has become customary for the President or the governor, or both, as the responsible heads of state, to issue proclamations calling upon the people to co-operate in the appropriate observance of the day. Similar proclamations are issued in connection with the commemoration of some significant event in national or local history, or for publicity purposes when a week is set aside to call the public's attention to a product of local industry or agriculture.

[Guaranty Trust Company of New York, *Bank and Public Holidays Throughout the World.*]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Profit Sharing was extremely rare before the Civil War. In 1867 the Bay State Shoe and Leather Company adopted a plan which distrib-

uted 25% of the net profits among the employees. Two years later Brewster & Company, New York, and A. S. Cameron & Company, Jersey City, inaugurated profit sharing plans. Other firms followed. Rand McNally & Company adopted the plan in 1879, Pillsbury Flour Mills, 1882, and Procter & Gamble Company, 1887. The first plan to last more than ten years was that of the Peace Dale Manufacturing Company of Peace Dale, R. I. This company began sharing profits with employees in 1878 and the plan was kept in force although a large part of the time no profits were earned.

During the World War, when profits were high, plans for sharing them with employees received more attention, but, as in 1921, the industrial recession of the early 1930's caused these plans to be abandoned.

As a method of stimulating the efficiency and improving the morale of the rank and file employees profit sharing has had indifferent success.

[N. P. Gilman, *Profit Sharing*; National Civic Federation, *Profit Sharing by American Employers*; National Industrial Conference Board, *Profit Sharing*.]

FRED M. JONES

Profiteering. A profiteer is one who makes what is considered an unreasonable profit by taking advantage of a public situation.

Silas Deane, while in France, 1776-78, was charged with lining his pockets at the nation's expense. Arthur Lee claimed that the supplies purchased in France were gifts by the French Government, that Deane, in requesting payment, was merely attempting to enrich himself.

During the Revolution the paper money rapidly declined in value. The people who profited by the situation were "the gamblers who speculated in the currency as it fluctuated."

The Government, under the Articles of Confederation^o, was so weak that the existing social and political unrest endangered property. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention of 1787^o were determined to protect property and public securities. Speculators, foreseeing the ultimate goal, took a few pieces of silver and bought millions of the existing paper currency. When the Government redeemed the certificates at par huge profits were realized. Holders of securities issued prior to the assumption of state debts likewise received large returns.

The profiteer took advantage of the War of 1812 to monopolize everything that had become a necessity. Sugar sold at fifty cents a pound, and salt at \$5 00 a bushel. It seems that these abnormal prices were in part the results of profiteering.

With Jackson's Presidency, there appeared the slogan, "To the victors belong the spoils," which dominated public appointments for half a century. Some officials sponsored appointments if candidates agreed to remunerate them if successful.

Jackson's opposition to the Second Bank of the United States^o was predicated upon the belief that the bank profited.

In moving the eastern Indian tribes to the West (*see* Indian Removal), individuals received contracts to furnish ample food on the journey. For increased profits the contractors scantily fed some of the tribes, often the quality of the food was bad.

The profiteers were active during the Mexican War, and, in 1849, the gold rush brought to California^o a great horde of speculators.

In the Civil War the Government had to pay excessive prices to contractors who furnished food and clothing to the soldiers (*see* Civil War Contracts). The soldiers' uniforms were made of "refuse stuff and sweepings of the shop," which the soldiers found after the first storm "scattered to the winds in rags. . . ."

During the Civil War the local and National governments paid bounties to volunteers. The result was "bounty jumping"^o. A man would enlist in one community and collect the bonuses there, then desert and enlist under a different name in another locality.

Fortunes were made, during Reconstruction^o, in politics. The carpetbag governor of Louisiana received an annual salary of \$8000. In four years he was worth over \$500,000.

To influence legislation, railway companies sold congressmen shares of stock at par when they were selling above par (*see* Crédit Mobilier).

President Grant was informed, but did not foresee the result, of the attempt of Jay Gould and James Fisk to corner the gold market to reap millions for themselves. Tweed's Ring^o in New York looted the public.

John D. Rockefeller secured special railroad rates for the gasoline he shipped and rebates^o on the shipments by his competitors.

The panic of 1893^o drained the Federal treasury of its gold supply. To keep the United States on the gold basis President Cleveland turned to J. P. Morgan for aid. He secured the desired gold, but the Morgan firm made on the transaction \$7,500,000.

By 1900 gigantic trusts^o controlled prices and wages in various industries. Laborers now organized to secure fair wages. With growing strength they too resorted to some questionable practices.

During the World War businessmen and laborers alike took advantage of the scarcity of goods and men. Wholesale dealers and packers hoarded food to sell later at excessive prices. The greed of the profiteer caused him "to make his country's need the opportunity for unwonted gain."

With the return of peace greed continued to permeate the National and state governments. An example is the Teapot Dome scandal⁷⁰.

In the 1920's the American people entered upon an orgy of speculation. The depression of 1929 resulted. The present era has witnessed a continuance of the profiteering which results from the alliance between politics and public enterprise.

[Bernard M. Baruch, *Taking the Profits Out of War*; Charles A. and Mary R. Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization*, J. B. McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*; Louis M. Hacker and B. B. Kendrick, *The United States since 1865*.]

GEORGE D. HARMON

Progress and Poverty is the *magnum opus* of Henry George (1839-97) and the bible of his Single Tax⁷¹ movement. The germinal 48-page essay, upon which the book was based, "Our Land and Land Policy," published in 1871, advocated the destruction of land monopoly by shifting all taxes from labor and its products to land. *Progress and Poverty* was begun in August, 1877 as "an inquiry into industrial depression and of increase of want with increase of wealth." Its publication in 1880 established a major American contribution to the literature of social reform, and exerted an appreciable influence upon modern theories of taxation.

[Henry George, Jr., *Henry George*.]

HARVEY WISH

Progressive Movement, THE (1908-24), had its roots in the political and social philosophy prevalent about 1908, when Theodore Roosevelt dominated the Republican party⁷² and the Bryan element had recovered the leadership in the Democratic party⁷³. The failure of Taft, elected in 1908, to carry out the Roosevelt policies, brought severe criticism from a group of western Republicans and induced an "insurgent" movement in Congress which manifested itself particularly in a revolt against the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Bill⁷⁴, and against the dictatorial powers of the Speaker⁷⁵, these revolts being led in the House by George W. Norris of Nebraska and Victor Murdock of Kansas, and in the Senate by Beveridge of Indiana, Dolliver and Cummins of Iowa and LaFollette of Wisconsin. A National Republican Progressive League was formed on

Jan. 21, 1911, at the Washington residence of Sen. LaFollette, a program of progressive measures was agreed upon, and LaFollette was brought out as the progressive candidate against Taft for the Republican presidential nomination. Later LaFollette was shelved for Roosevelt, Taft won renomination after a bitter campaign and a violently contested convention, and Roosevelt organized the Progressive party (see "Bull Moose" Party). The resulting split in the Republican party gave an easy victory to the Democrats (see Campaign of 1912), now definitely under progressive control, and there followed, under President Wilson, a period of thoroughly progressive legislation until interrupted by the World War. The progressive movement was revived after the war, being manifested in renewed insurgency in Congress, the organization of the Agricultural and Progressive Blocs, and finally the launching by LaFollette⁷⁶ of his Progressive party in 1924. LaFollette's defeat and later death, together with the conservative control of both parties after 1924, practically ended the progressive movement as originally conceived, although it may be said to have been revived around new issues and in a more far-reaching manner in the New Deal⁷⁷ led by Franklin D. Roosevelt.

[Robert M. LaFollette, *LaFollette's Autobiography*; Benjamin P. DeWitt, *The Progressive Movement*; Joseph Bucklin Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time*; Harold Howland, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Times*; Herbert S. Duffy, *William Howard Taft*, Claude G. Bowers, *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*; Bruce Bliven, *Progressivism at the Cross Roads*, in *Current History*, Vol. 22; William Allen White, *The End of an Epoch—the Passing of the Apostles of Liberalism in the United States*, in *Scribner's Magazine*, Vol. 79.]

CLARENCE A. BERDAHL

Prohibition. The ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment⁷⁸, Jan. 29, 1919, and the subsequent enactment by Congress of the Volstead Act⁷⁹, marked the culmination of a long campaign in the United States against the liquor traffic. Although the origin of the movement is to be found in colonial protests against the excessive use of intoxicants, the temperance⁸⁰ crusaders did not turn from moral suasion to legal coercion until the middle of the 19th century. Three periods of legislative activity thereafter are apparent. Between 1846 and 1855, following the lead of Maine, thirteen states passed prohibitory laws. Within a decade, however, nine of these measures either had been repealed or had been declared unconstitutional. After Kansas in 1880 had written prohibition into its constitution, there was a revival, stimulated by the persistent efforts of the Prohibition party (1869), the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (1874) and,

most powerful of all, the Anti-Saloon League (1893)⁹⁹. Again results were impermanent, for by 1905 only Kansas, Maine, Nebraska and North Dakota were prohibition states.

The failure of the brewers and distillers to set their houses in order, and the judicious political tactics of the Anti-Saloon League, prepared the way for the final drive to outlaw the saloon⁹⁹. A wide range of motivation influenced the voters, as they went to the polls under local option⁹⁹ laws in the various states. The ardent reformers relentlessly pressed their arguments that the liquor interests represented a demoralizing force in American politics, that the mechanization of industry placed a premium upon the sober employee and that the taxpayer really paid the bills for a business which was filling the poorhouses and prisons with its victims. On the eve of the entrance of the United States into the World War, twenty-six states had prohibitory laws, of which thirteen could be described as "bone-dry." Wayne B. Wheeler, Ernest H. Cherrington and other leaders of the Anti-Saloon League, who had already mobilized the forces of evangelical Protestantism, were quick to associate prohibition with the winning of the war. Congressional action re-enforced their arguments.

By December, 1917, both Senate and House had approved a resolution, originally proposed by Sen. Morris Sheppard of Texas, to add an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the "manufacture, sale or transportation" of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes. Within thirteen months ratification by the legislatures of three quarters of the states had been secured, and a year later the Eighteenth Amendment went into effect. Meanwhile, Congress had placed restrictions upon the manufacture of intoxicants, as a war measure to conserve grain, and had provided that from July 1, 1919, until the end of the war no distilled spirits, beer or wine should be sold for beverage purposes.

The opponents of prohibition soon directed their attack against the efforts of governmental agents to enforce the law. They approved the banishment of the saloon, but they insisted that it had been replaced by illegal "speakeasies" and night clubs⁹⁹. The illicit traffic in intoxicants was breeding "rum runners," racketeers and gangsters⁹⁹; corruption was rampant in Federal and state enforcement units; and disrespect for all law was becoming a characteristic of those who flouted the liquor laws with impunity. The supporters of the Eighteenth Amendment, on the other hand, admitted that enforcement was far from perfect, but proclaimed prohibition's benefits—reduced poverty, increased bank de-

posits and expanding industry. For them it was a basic factor in the nation's prosperity from 1923 to 1929.

But popular disgust over the failure of enforcement grew so steadily, partly as a by-product of the depression, that the Democratic National Convention in 1932 demanded repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment. The Democratic landslide in the November elections persuaded Congress that the time for action had come. In the short session (Feb. 20, 1933) a resolution was approved providing for an amendment to accomplish repeal. Submitted to conventions in the several states, the Twenty-first Amendment⁹⁹ was ratified within less than a year.

Before ratification Congress, on March 22, 1933, had legalized sale of beverages containing no more than 3.2% of alcohol, wherever state law did not contravene. Repeal ended the first experiment on the part of the American people in writing sumptuary legislation into the fundamental law of the land. The liquor problem was turned back to the states.

[E. H. Cherrington, *The Evolution of Prohibition in the United States*; C. Merz, *The Dry Decade*.]

JOHN A. KROUT

Prohibition Party, THE, oldest of the third parties, was organized in 1869 after nearly three quarters of a century of temperance⁹⁹ agitation had failed to impress the major parties. The campaign of 1872 marked its initial appearance in national politics. Nine states were represented at its first national convention in Columbus, Ohio, Feb. 22, 1872. James Black of Pennsylvania was nominated for President. Prior to 1872 candidates for state offices had been nominated in some states. In its early years the party was strongest in Ohio and New York, holding the balance of power in the latter in the presidential election of 1884. Candidates have appeared in every presidential campaign, although never winning an elector. The peak of its popular support was reached in 1892 with 271,000 votes, and the low ebb in 1928 with a total of 20,000. In 1896 the money question temporarily split the party (*see* Campaign of 1896).

Through its educational activities and its strong appeal to the moral sentiment of the people, the party exerted an influence for a more effective governmental policy toward the liquor problem. While its primary object has been the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, it has advocated other political, economic and social reforms, many of which have been endorsed by the major parties.

[Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency*; D. R. Dewey, *National Problems*.]

GLENN H. BENTON

Promontory Point, Utah, marked the dramatic completion of the first transcontinental railroad (May 10, 1869). A motley crowd gathered to witness final ceremonies. Following prayers and brief but grandiloquent speeches, President Leland Stanford of the Central Pacific[™] nervously drove the last golden spike into a polished California laurel tie with a silver sledge hammer. Western Union telegraph apparatus was connected with the spike, and these final strokes were instantly heralded in all cities of the land. Two locomotives, *Juniper* and *119*, hastened to move forward until their noses touched; and a cheering crowd confirmed a single word telegram: "Done."

[Edwin L. Sabin, *Building the Pacific Railroad*; George T. Clark, *Leland Stanford*.] OSCAR OSBURN WINTHER

Propaganda may be defined as any ideas and doctrines which are intentionally propagated. The objectives, motives and methods of propagandizing vary. Objectives may be specific as in the case of an advertising campaign, or general as in the case of a world-wide philosophical, political, social, or religious reform movement. They may be socially commendable or reprehensible according to the standards used to evaluate them. Motives may be concealed or expressed, publicly approved or condemned. Methods used include the most refined techniques of logical argument, statistical presentation and use of authorities; also stunts, overt acts and subtle types of suggestion designed to arouse the emotions. Since the World War the word propaganda has often assumed an invidious connotation, less frequently in the writings of serious students than in discussions of popular commentators. The spread of democracy and extension of the suffrage, the expansion of educational facilities and increase of literacy, technological changes and improvements in the field of communications, economic transformations in production, distribution and consumption producing the phenomenon of mass economics, as well as the increasing need for social co-operation in peace and war, have greatly affected the scope, method and effects of propaganda activities. Propaganda assumes greatest historical significance when carried on systematically over long periods of time by large and well-organized groups.

During the colonial period in America extensive propaganda activities were carried on by religious institutions, such as church denominations and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel[™], by trading companies, chambers of commerce, groups of workers, and public officials. Political propaganda assumed large proportions

during the years immediately preceding the Revolutionary War, under the astute direction of Samuel Adams using the channels of Committees of Correspondence[™]. The propagandistic writings of Thomas Paine were likewise enormously effective (see *Common Sense*). The struggle for ratification of the Constitution[™] produced the classic compilation of arguments known as the Federalist papers[™].

The development of political propaganda in the United States is largely the story of the development of political parties[™]. The presidential campaign of 1828[™], in which Andrew Jackson won, was a landmark. Since then political propaganda has been affected by the increasing size of the electorate, the deepening of sectional, class, and economic cleavages, the growing importance of economic issues, and improvements in means of communication and contact. The advent of the radio, and its use in political campaigns since 1924, has altered techniques, and probably influenced the tempo of public opinion changes. The expansion of governmental activities, the increase in public expenditures, the rising costs of nationwide campaigns, and refinements in propaganda techniques have altered the character of political campaigns and given decided advantages to the party in power.

The rise of aggregations of labor and capital has greatly intensified the competition of propagandists. The two most comprehensive and active propagandists for American business are the National Association of Manufacturers (1895) and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States (1912)[™]. In 1938 these two organizations launched their most intensive campaign with the slogan "What Helps Business Helps You." The practice of lobbying[™], the attempt to influence public officials directly, has been supplemented and in some cases supplanted by propaganda activities designed to influence Government indirectly through public opinion[™] leadership.

The American Federation of Labor (1886) and the Congress of Industrial Organizations (1935)[™] have been pre-eminent in propagating labor's point of view. In general their methods are similar to those of business groups, except that they take a more active part in elections and political contests. The National Grange (1867) and the Farm Bureau Federation (1919)[™] have been active propagandists of agricultural policies. There are approximately 10,000 commercial and industrial organizations in the United States of which 1500 or more are interstate, national, or international. Most of these organizations carry on propaganda activities to a greater or less extent.

There is scarcely a field of human activity in which propaganda organizations have not arisen. In addition to racial, religious, occupational, professional, age and sectional groups, hosts of special purpose organizations exist to propagate particular ideas (*see* Pressure Groups). More than 500 national associations have headquarters in Washington and seek directly or indirectly to mold public opinion and public policy. In some cases the propaganda activities cancel one another. In other cases, logrolling⁷⁰ is practised, and the influence of small but active groups is large. The American Anti-Slavery Society (1833)⁷¹ was one of the most influential propagandist agencies in pre-Civil War days. The American Peace Society (1828)⁷² is one of the oldest of numerous organizations seeking to further the cause of peace. The Anti-Saloon League of America, the American Legion⁷³, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Civil Service Reform League, and the National Council for the Prevention of War are examples of special purpose propaganda organizations.

The World War injected the National Government into the propaganda arena on an unprecedented scale (*see* World War, Propaganda and Undercover Activities). Since the war the role of propaganda in the United States has been markedly affected by. (1) the increasing use of propaganda by governmental agencies, national, state and local, (2) the availability of new instruments of mass impression⁷⁴ such as radio and motion pictures; (3) refinements in technique accompanied by greater specialization, as illustrated by the rise of public relations counsellors and the use of more precise methods for ascertaining public opinion trends; (4) increased attention of business executives to problems of public relations and propaganda as distinct from those of advertising; (5) the rise of state propaganda machines accompanied by a more intensive competition of propagandas in the field of international relations; and (6) an increasing emphasis upon the specialized study of propaganda as a social phenomenon.

[Harwood L. Childs, *Labor and Capital in National Politics*, and *A Reference Guide to the Study of Public Opinion*; Harwood L. Childs, ed., *Pressure Groups and Propaganda*, in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 179; Merle Curti, *Peace or War, The American Struggle, 1636-1936*; Leonard W. Doob, *Propaganda, Its Psychology and Technique*; Elmer Ellis, *Education against Propaganda*, *The National Council for Social Studies, Seventh Yearbook*, 1937; Federal Trade Commission, *Summary Report to the Senate of the United States on Efforts by Associations and Agencies of Electric and Gas Utilities to Influence Public Opinion*; William Gellermann, *The American Legion as Educator*; E. P. Herring, *Group Representation before Congress*; Harold D. Lasswell, *Propaganda Technique in the World War*; Harold D. Lass-

well, Ralph D. Casey, Bruce L. Smith, *Propaganda and Promotional Activities—An Annotated Bibliography*; Frederick E. Lumley, *The Propaganda Menace*; John C. Miller, *Sam Adams, Pioneer in Propaganda*; Peter H. Odegard, *Pressure Politics, The Story of the Anti-Saloon League*; Bessie L. Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States*; S. H. Walker and Paul Sklar, *Business Finds Its Voice*.]

HARWOOD L. CHILDS

Property. The most important classification of property is that which divides it into real and personal. In general, real property has reference to land and things permanently attached to land, which are immovable or which ordinarily go with the land when it is conveyed, such as trees, buildings and fences. Personal property, on the other hand, has reference to all other property which is capable of ownership.

Another classification, cutting across both of the above classes, divides property into corporeal and incorporeal, the former referring to tangibles, such as land, livestock, implements, furniture, automobiles and the like, and the latter referring to intangibles, such as contract rights, franchises, claims against others because of personal injuries, notes, stocks, bonds, insurance policies and rights of action of various kinds. Corporeal personal property is also known as chattels or goods.

In a popular sense, property usually consists of concrete things or substances but more frequently, in the eyes of the law, it consists of legal relations between a person called the owner and other people. The owner's legal rights constitute his property. Hence, when one owns property he has a "bundle of legal rights," the essential one of which is the power of more or less exclusive control. Such things as air, light, water in streams, birds, fish and wild animals, not being capable of exclusive control, are not capable of ownership, until reduced to possession.

The feudal system of land tenures introduced in England by William the Conqueror was based upon the theory that all land was owned by the king, who allotted it among his lords, who in turn parcelled out its use among the villeins, who tilled it. The interests thus created, however, were not absolute, but conditional upon military and other services being rendered to the lord and king. Through the years the rights of the lords to such services were gradually reduced by statutes, until a more or less absolute ownership (called free and common socage) was created in the villeins.

This was the type of land ownership in England when the American colonies were settled, and it was this system that was transplanted to

America. Hence the American law of real property is based on that of England after the feudal system had disappeared. Though all land titles in the United States originate with the state, the state, having no right to services, is not an overlord in the feudal sense. There are, however, important limitations on ownership of land. No type of ownership can be said to be absolute. An owner may not use his land in such a way as to create a nuisance or injure his neighbor. Property may be taken for taxes, and is subject to execution for the payment of debts. It is also liable to escheat in the event of the death of the owner without a will or heirs, and is subject to the power of eminent domain⁷⁰ and to curtailment under the police power⁷¹.

The subjection of both real and personal property to the police power is of growing importance. Public utilities⁷², such as transportation, communication, electric light and power companies, are said to be businesses "affected with a public interest"⁷³. In contradistinction to a strictly private business they must serve all who apply and are subject to close legislative regulation⁷⁴ as to rates charged and quality of service rendered. Since a business is property, this constitutes an encroachment upon ownership. But the line between such a business and one that is said to be private has grown less distinct with the years. Many businesses formerly classed as private are now subject to such governmental supervision as the public interest seems to demand. A law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicants is valid (*see* Prohibition), though it curtails the use of property devoted to distilling and brewing. Similarly, the laws prohibiting the slaughtering of cattle within certain areas, regulating the hours and wages⁷⁵ of labor for women, prohibiting construction of business houses in specified zones have been held valid, though they restrict the use of property and sometimes materially reduce its value. These are but illustrations of the many ways in which individual private property rights may be invaded in the interest of the public welfare. Though state and Federal legislative power to curtail the use of private property is limited by the "due process"⁷⁶ clauses of the Constitution, recent decisions indicate that this protection is less obstinate than formerly. Property interests once regarded as immune from interference have now been brought within the scope of legislative treatment, with the approval of the courts (*see* Business, Public Control of).

Though title to land or an interest therein may be acquired by adverse possession, statutes in all American states provide for the convey-

ance or transfer of land by deed, a document required to be signed by the grantor and delivered to the grantee.

Interests in land that are inheritable under the law (*see* Freeholder), upon the death of the owner pass to the owner's heirs, in most states, or if there be a will, to the devisees named in it. Statutes in all American states provide for the recording in a public office, of deeds, mortgages and other instruments affecting title to land, so that notice may be given to the world of the facts relative to the title. Instruments not so recorded, though valid as between the parties to them, do not affect others who have no notice of them. A document in which are copied the various links in the chain of title so that the history of ownership may be examined, is known as an Abstract of Title.

Title to personal property may be transferred by delivery merely or by agreement. No formal document of transfer comparable to a deed is usually required. Upon the death of the owner of personal property, the title passes to the executor or administrator. The next of kin of the owner have no rights with respect to the property until the debts of the owner have been paid and the estate finally settled.

Statutes regarding property interests have been passed in all states. Many of them are simply a codification of certain common law rules. Others have materially changed the law. Examples of the latter are: the broadening of the scope of the term "heirs" by the abolition of the doctrine of primogeniture⁷⁷, the abolition or modification of the fee tail estate, the granting to married women of the power to own and control both real and personal property (*see* Married Women's Property Rights), the providing for a system of recording deeds, mortgages and other instruments affecting property titles, and the simplification of the form of such instruments.

As affecting the ownership and transfer of various types of personal property in the United States a noteworthy movement is that in the direction of uniformity in the law of the various states. This is being brought about through enactment by the several states of identical statutes covering such subjects as negotiable instruments, bills of lading, warehouse receipts and the sales of goods.

[Ray A. Brown, *Law of Personal Property*; H. T. Tiffany, *Law of Real Property*.]

GEORGE W. GOBLE

Property Qualifications. In an exact sense, property qualifications for voting prescribe the ownership of certain kinds of property, usually to a minimum value, as requisite to the exercise

of the right of suffrage⁷⁷. They are closely related to taxpaying qualifications, and, negatively, to disqualification because of pauperism⁷⁸. Considerable diversity existed in the suffrage laws of the thirteen original states, taxpaying, freehold, or direct property qualifications being required generally. As a result manhood suffrage did not exist at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. It has been estimated that the qualifications then in force excluded one fourth of the free adult males in the North and one half of them in the South. Influenced both by economic conditions and democratic doctrines the newer frontier commonwealths of the West tended to reduce or abolish property and taxpaying qualifications. Seaboard states followed suit, Massachusetts admitting all adult male poll-taxpaying citizens in 1820, and New York granting suffrage to all white adult male citizens in 1826. By 1850 white manhood suffrage was approximately established throughout the country. Since the Civil War the taxpaying qualification has found favor chiefly in the South as one means of reducing the Negro vote (*see* Disfranchisement, Southern, of the Negro). Vestiges of direct property qualifications still persist in a few states. In twelve states vagrants, paupers and persons on relief⁷⁹ are excluded. Administration of provisions of the latter character caused acute controversy during the presidential campaigns of 1932 and 1936 because of the large number of unemployed.

[K. H. Porter, *History of Suffrage in the United States.*]

ROBERT C. BROOKS

Prophet's Town, on the west bank of the Wabash River, just below the mouth of the Tippecanoe (present Tippecanoe County, Ind.), became the headquarters of The Prophet (Tenskwatawa), Shawnee orator and reformer and brother of Tecumseh⁸⁰, in 1808. Groups of north-western tribesmen, dissatisfied with white encroachments, gathered here and planned a concerted resistance. After the battle of Tippecanoe⁸¹ The Prophet abandoned the town and Harrison destroyed it (1811).

[Logan Esarey, *A History of Indiana from Its Exploration to 1850*; Benjamin Drake, *Life of Tecumseh and of His Brother, The Prophet.*]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Proportional Representation is a method of electing a legislative or representative body designed to give every substantial body of opinion approximately the same proportion of the members elected that it has of the votes cast. It requires election at large or election from districts large enough to elect several members each. In a five-member district it will permit any group with one fifth of the votes to elect one of the

five members, and a group with three fifths to elect three. It thus combines majority rule with minority representation.

There are several forms of proportional representation. One of these, the party "list system," is used extensively and with numerous variations on the continent of Europe. The only form which has found wide acceptance in English-speaking countries is the Hare system⁸² or "single transferable vote." Under this method each voter casts a single vote, though several are to be elected, but may safeguard that vote against being wasted by indicating not only a first choice but a second choice, third choice and so on for as many choices as he pleases. This is usually done by numbers 1, 2, 3, etc. placed opposite the names of the candidates chosen. A "quota" of voters entitled to one representative is either fixed arbitrarily by law, in which case the number elected will vary, or calculated each time on the basis of the vote cast so as to result in the election of a fixed number. If a voter's vote cannot be used to make up this quota for his first choice, because his first choice does not need it or is hopelessly out of the running, it is transferred according to definite rules to the first of the voter's choices whom it can help to elect.

This method is now in use in this country for city council elections in Boulder, Colo. (since 1917), Cincinnati, Ohio (1924), Hamilton, Ohio (1925), Toledo, Ohio (1934), Wheeling, W. Va. (1935), New York City (1936) and Yonkers, N. Y. (1938). Its most striking effect in American cities has been the curbing of the power of political machines⁸³.

[George H. Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation—The Key to Democracy*; C. G. Hoag and G. H. Hallett, Jr., *Proportional Representation.*]

GEORGE H. HALLETT, JR.

Proprietary Agent. The Duke of York in New York, the Carolina board, Lord Baltimore in Maryland, and Penn in Pennsylvania found it necessary to employ agents to attend to colonial business both in London and in the province. Sir John Werden served as the Duke of York's agent in England and John Lewin went to the colony as special agent to report on financial conditions. Before 1700 Henry Darnall served Lord Baltimore as a private agent in Maryland and this office was continued through the colonial era. Proprietors frequently acted as their own agents in London. Until his health failed William Penn transacted in London all important business relating to his province. F. J. Paris frequently acted during the 18th century as London agent for the Penn family and other private interests. For long years James Logan was the

efficient agent of William Penn and his sons in the Quaker colony, looking after the survey and sale of lands, the collection of proprietary revenue, and the management of estates.

[Mabel P. Wolff, *The Colonial Agency of Pennsylvania*; E. P. Lilly, *The Colonial Agents of New York and New Jersey*; H. L. Osgood, *American Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*.]

WINFRED T. ROOT

Proprietary Provinces. The proprietorship succeeded the trading company^m as a device employed to build England's colonial empire (see Colonial Policy, The British). The proprietary provinces had a familiar precedent in English history, being patterned, in general, upon the ancient Palatinate of Durham in which the feudal lord enjoyed large powers which enabled him to guard the English border against Scotch forays. Originating in a royal grant (see Chartered Colonies) bestowing broad territorial and political powers upon a single person or a small group (the lord proprietor or the lords proprietors), the proprietary province was virtually a feudal jurisdiction in which, with specified exemptions, the lord proprietor exercised sovereign powers. He could appoint all officials; create courts, hear appeals, pardon offenders; make laws, issue decrees; raise and command a militia; establish churches, ports and towns. The charters of Maryland and Pennsylvania contained the important limitation requiring the proprietor to make laws by and with the consent of the freemen^m. These provinces were, thus, feudal only in name. The proprietors were forced to hearken to the insistent demands of the people and to yield to them political privileges and powers (see Colonial Assemblies). The land of the proprietary province, however, constituted a great private domain. The proprietor granted it to settlers on his own terms. He could mortgage it for debt, as William Penn did. New provinces could come into existence by subgrants. Estates could be transferred into new hands by purchase.

By 1630 the trading company venture of the Virginia Company^m had proved a failure, the Council for New England^m was moribund, and when the next important royal grant was made, that of Maryland to Lord Baltimore in 1632, it was of the feudal or proprietary type described above. And when, seven years later, Sir Ferdinando Gorges^m received a royal charter for Maine, as compensation for his part in the Council for New England, the grant was also of the feudal or proprietary type, and as such was sold by Gorges' heir, in 1678, to Massachusetts (see Maine under Massachusetts).

When, in 1664, an English fleet drove Dutch

power from New Netherland the king granted the region, including what came to be known as New York, New Jersey and Delaware, to the Duke of York^m as a proprietary, but when, in 1688, the Duke became James II, New York, being the part still remaining in his hands, became a royal colony (see New York, Colony of).

The area of New Jersey had, in 1664, been subgranted by the Duke of York to John, Lord Berkeley and Sir George Carteret, and in 1682 the Duke had subgranted Delaware to William Penn. In 1674 Berkeley sold his share of New Jersey for £1000 and West Jersey^m, as the region was known, soon came into the hands of a board of Quakers. In 1680 another group purchased East Jersey^m from the Carteret estate. The proprietary right, so far as the land is concerned, to both of these areas still exists in the Councils of the Proprietors of New Jersey^m.

By the charters of 1663 and 1665 a group of eight men, royal courtiers and colonial planters, received the broad area of Carolina^m in which two colonies came into existence under one board which continued until 1729 when the proprietors, wearying of the unprofitable colonial business, sold their proprietary rights to the king, with the exception of one parcel which came to be known as the Granville Grant^m.

Pennsylvania, founded under a charter issued to William Penn in 1681, was the last of the proprietary colonies. Thereafter the policy was definitely in the direction of the royal colony^m. At the outbreak of the Revolution there remained of the proprietary colonies only Pennsylvania and Delaware, in the hands of the Penn family, and Maryland, in the hands of the Calvert family.

The American Revolution cut the political ties between England and the colonies and thereby placed the ultimate power in the people of the several states. Popular and independent state governments were promptly created. It was certain that the great proprietary estates would be swept away in the flood of democracy. The great estates of the Penn and Calvert heirs were confiscated by the popular assemblies and disposed of in harmony with popular desires. The state governments were not generous in the process of confiscation. The largest estate was that of the Penn family valued at about one million pounds sterling. The legislature paid the Penns £130,000. The Maryland government gave Lord Baltimore £10,000 for the confiscated land, a sum deemed so inadequate that the British government paid him an additional £90,000. The Granville estate also passed into the control of the state. (See also Fairfax Proprietary.)

A feudal and proprietary land system thus ceased to be. These great areas became public property. The legislatures abolished quitrents⁹⁹ paid into the pockets of the proprietors. The land was sold in smaller portions, thus making for economic democracy. And the sale of confiscated lands helped to pay for the war.

[C. P. Nettels, *Roots of American Civilization*, pp. 677-687; J. F. Jameson, *American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*, Chap. II.]

WINFRED T. ROOT

Proslavery. Not until after the controversy over the admission of Missouri, 1819-21, did the South justify slavery upon principle. Before that time the intellectual and political leaders had condemned slavery on principle, but had defended it upon the ground of expediency, namely, that the South could not free the Negroes and permit them to remain in the same country as the whites without danger of race conflict and perhaps the extermination of one or the other race—as actually occurred in San Domingo. However, nearly every well-informed Southerner during the latter part of the 18th and early 19th century seriously pondered the question of emancipation and colonization. The result of this was the formation of the American Colonization Society⁹⁹ whose object was to solve the slavery question and the race question simultaneously by emancipating and colonizing the slaves outside the United States and specifically in Liberia⁹⁹. The Colonization Society though supported nationally had its greatest strength in the Southern states, and may be looked upon as a typically Southern institution. The Missouri Compromise⁹⁹ controversy, occurring only two years after the society was formed, disclosed a widespread hostility in the North against the institution of slavery and revealed strong signs of sectional animosity toward the South. For the first time slavery and slaveholders, and even the South as a section, were denounced by the Northern and Western members of Congress in hot, unmeasured terms. An examination of the debates in and out of Congress during this controversy shows little attempt on the part of Southern leaders to defend slavery upon moral grounds. Their only defense of the institution was that slavery was a necessary evil and that this necessary evil had strong constitutional guarantees.

However, the Northern attack upon slavery and upon the South alarmed even such nationalists as Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. An examination of the private correspondence of these and other public men in the South discloses a much deeper concern and a much more

prolonged and thoughtful consideration of slavery and of sectionalism⁹⁹ among Southern leaders than has been supposed. The result was that several writers in the ten years following the Missouri controversy completely reversed the position of the South and justified slavery upon moral, religious and social grounds (*see Calhoun Exposition*). However, this philosophical defense of slavery gained little headway and would probably have been relegated to oblivion had not William Lloyd Garrison and Theodore Weld begun in 1831 the radical abolition⁹⁹ movement which demanded immediate and uncompensated emancipation by act of the National Government. So vitriolic and dangerous did this abolition crusade seem to Southerners that within a few months a revolution took place in Southern thought. Thomas R. Dew, Chancellor Harper, James Hammond, John C. Calhoun, Edmund Ruffin and Thomas Cooper, to mention only a few of the new defenders of slavery, took up the sporadic defense of the post-Missouri Compromise decade and elaborated and perfected it. Within five years the South became definitely convinced that slavery was not only not an evil, but that it was a positive good. This justification or philosophy of Negro slavery was closely thought out. It carried conviction to most of the Southern people. Those who did not agree with it as a whole almost invariably accepted it in part, and all were indignant at the abolitionist attacks upon Southern morals and life, and were agreed as to the expediency of slavery under the circumstances.

The philosophy of slavery or the proslavery argument may be summed up briefly. In the first place, to those who accepted the literal meaning of the Scriptures—and the majority of Southerners, and Northerners, too, for that matter, were orthodox—the Bible furnished scores if not hundreds of passages which unequivocally sanctioned slavery. Next it was shown that all great civilizations had grown up in the midst if not upon the backs of slaves; in other words, that history had placed its seal upon the institution of slavery. Then there was the economic justification for American slavery, namely, that two billions of dollars—by 1860—were invested directly in slaves and that other billions were indirectly invested through the medium of lands and cotton⁹⁹ whose values and production depended upon slavery. Finally, there was the social justification, which appealed more or less to every Southerner, whether slaveholder or nonslaveholder. This was the race problem, namely, that two races so different as the white and Negro races could not live in the same community or country upon

terms of equality. One or the other must dominate, or destroy the other. The whites declared it their right to dominate, first upon the assumption that the Negro race was an inferior race, and finally upon what was considered scientific proof that the Negro race was an inferior race. This proof had been offered by such anthropologists as Nott and Glidden in articles and books. Without reference either to the assumption of racial superiority or scientific proof of this superiority the Southern whites were agreed that their race should dominate in order to maintain the integrity and civilization of the white race.

[Albert J. Beveridge, *Abraham Lincoln, 1809-1858*, Vol. II, Chap. I; Hilary A. Herbert, *The Abolition Crusade and Its Consequences*; A. Y. Lloyd, *The Slavery Controversy*; Glover Moore, "The Missouri Controversy, 1819-1821," in *The Joint University Libraries*, Nashville, Tenn.]

FRANK L. OWSLEY

Proslavery Literature. The weight of Southern public opinion was always in support of slavery⁹⁹. Even during the Revolutionary period, when natural rights⁹⁹ philosophy was generally accepted, Southerners used "hackneyed arguments" in defense of slavery. Proslavery sentiment, quiescent for some years, became vocal after the heated sectional dispute over Missouri (see Missouri Compromise), and Whitemarsh R. Seabrook and Thomas Cooper, pioneers in the philosophical defense of slavery, touched upon almost every defense later used by the slavery apologists. They wrote that slavery was practically universal, was nowhere forbidden in the Bible, was profitable to the whites, and beneficial to the Negroes. Thomas R. Dew, however, penned the classic statement of the positive good theory in his *Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature of 1831 and 1832* (1832). William Harper, James Henry Hammond and William Gilmore Simms elaborated Dew's views but added little thereto in *The Pro-Slavery Argument* (1852). They attacked the theory that all men are equal and possessed of natural rights, and argued that slavery was the ladder from barbarism to civilization. John C. Calhoun⁹⁹ did much to secure the acceptance of this philosophy through his writings and speeches in Congress. Edmund Ruffin popularized similar views in his essays, and James D. B. DeBow⁹⁹ circulated the philosophy in his *Review*. George Fitzhugh in *Sociology for the South* (1854) and *Cannibals All* (1857) argued that slavery was the best defense against socialism and communism. J. C. Nott and J. H. Van Evrie, noted physicians, added the weight of ethnology and medical science to the historical, social and Biblical defense

Prostitution

of slavery, all of which ministers expounded from their pulpits.

[A. C. Craven, *Edmund Ruffin, Southerner*; W. E. Dodd, *The Cotton Kingdom*; A. B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition*; W. S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South*; Dumas Malone, *The Public Life of Thomas Cooper*.]

FLETCHER M. GREEN

Prospectors are persons who explore for minerals. The desire to find a gold mine, the hope that one day he will strike it rich, haunts the true prospector to his dying day. For a mere grubstake he will trade a half interest in his discoveries. Otherwise he will spend his holidays and vacations seeking the elusive bonanza. William Green Russell is typical. Twice (1849 and 1853) he went from the Georgia gold mines⁹⁹ to California's rich deposits. In 1858 he led a party to the foothills north of Pikes Peak and found the placer deposit which, greatly exaggerated, precipitated the Pikes Peak gold rush⁹⁹. In 1859 he led another party from Georgia to rich deposits in Russell Gulch above Central City, Colo. After the Civil War he returned again to Colorado and the last two summers before he died he spent placer mining⁹⁹ in the San Luis Valley.

Most prospectors are not placer miners by trade as was Russell. George Jackson was a hunter and trapper who was first touched by the gold fever in the California rush⁹⁹. When he made his discovery at Idaho Springs, Colo., he was equipped with a hunting knife and tin cup instead of a pick and pan. Bob Womack, who precipitated the Cripple Creek⁹⁹ gold rush in 1893, was a cowboy and ranch hand who had the gold fever. Even when riding the range he could not resist picking up unusual pieces of rock. George Washington Carmack, who discovered Bonanza Creek Aug. 10, 1896, in the Klondike⁹⁹ combined prospecting with trading with the Yukon Indians. The rare metals have opened new fields for the prospector. When Samuel Conger learned what tungsten was, he remembered an old mine abandoned forty years before and located one of Colorado's richest tungsten mines.

The prospector by his zealously has accelerated the development and settlement of the West. His discoveries forced the Cherokees from Georgia, the Sioux from the Black Hills, and the Arapahoes, Cheyennes and Utes from Colorado⁹⁹.

[G. C. Quiett, *Pay Dirt*.]

PERCY S. FRITZ

Prostitution. In the colonial period there was everywhere more or less sexual irregularity, but it was in general not commercialized. Prostitu-

tion consists of promiscuous sexual relationships between a number of men and perhaps one fifteenth or one twentieth of that number of women, who thus devote a large proportion of their time to sexual activity and receive their compensation in money, without permanent affection, status or security. Hence it developed in places where there was an excess of men over women: the French colonies on the Gulf, and in the industrial cities and frontier towns of post-colonial days. The United States has followed in general the English practice of official ignoring of prostitution, and not the continental practice of permitting it under license and supervision. The common law, however, regarded it as a crime only when it became offensive to public decency. The practice tended to become segregated in vice or "red-light" areas of cities.

Toward the end of the 19th century new repressive legislation was enacted, but until about 1900 these laws were aimed against the prostitute herself. More effective modes of legal attack began with the Iowa injunction and abatement law of 1909, under which any taxpayer might institute an action in equity against the property used for prostitution. During the following decade a vigorous campaign flourished against prostitution, through citizens' committees, vice commissions, the American Social Hygiene Association, and various social hygiene and public health organizations. Laws were enacted against pandering, procuring and transporting women across state borders (*see* Mann Act), laws were made to define and control "wayward minors," and to compel examination and treatment for venereal disease (*see* Hygiene). Special measures by Federal agencies and the army during the World War helped to control prostitution in the neighborhood of army camps.

Partly as a result of all these measures, it is believed that prostitution, at least in its more obvious forms, has diminished, although some authorities believe there was a setback during the depression of 1930-36. Evidence indicates that other forms of sexual irregularity, more clandestine and less localized, less commercial and more personal, and involving a larger number of women, have increased as professional prostitution has decreased.

[Mabel A. Elliott and F. E. Merrill, *Social Disorganization*; H. B. Woolston, *Prostitution in the United States*.]

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM

Protection in practice is usually mingled in some proportion with the revenue purpose, sometimes one, sometimes the other, predominating (*see* Revenue, The Public). Throughout the greater part of American history our people

preferred to support the Federal Government by indirect taxes. Customs duties⁹⁷ were a part of this program. But it is difficult to supply revenue needs by use of tariffs⁹⁸ without producing some protection. Thus, in the earlier years of the United States—from 1789 to 1816—the discussions of every tariff bill were attended by congressional debates on protection although, in most instances, the professed intention was revenue.

According to most authorities the distinct protective policy began with the tariff act of 1816. At the conclusion of the War of 1812 great quantities of English goods were dumped upon American markets. New manufactures which had sprung up during the war, and in the twenty preceding years, claimed inability to meet the competition. Some idea of the extent of the importations is shown by the fact that the inbound trade which, because of war interference, had dropped to \$12,900,000 in 1814 became \$113,000,000 in 1815 and \$147,100,000 in 1816. A cry for protection went up in many quarters. The hard times which followed the Panic of 1819⁹⁹ spread this sentiment over much of the country. For some years there was a strong popular demand for defense against foreign imports. The tariff acts of 1824 and 1828 granted further protection (over 1816) to certain groups, such as textiles and the manufactures of iron. Not only manufacturers, but certain agricultural groups called for action against foreign competition. Among farmers, producers of wool, hemp, flax, and, in some cases, growers of corn and wheat joined the ranks of the protectionists. The movement was strongest in the Middle and then Western states, where farming dominated. The home market argument supplied much of the reasoning. Henry Clay was the chief exponent of this doctrine. He urged in Congress that "the home market is first in order and paramount in importance." Another of his phrases was that "the War of the Revolution had effected our political emancipation; the late war [1812] greatly contributed to our commercial freedom, but our complete independence will only be consummated after the policy of protection shall be recognized and adopted" (*see* American System). The first protective phase in our tariff history culminated with the Tariff of Abominations¹⁰⁰ (1828). Thereafter, through readjustments and compromises, the rates worked lower. There was a brief setback in the act of 1842, but the Walker tariff of 1846 again set the country on the road to freer trade.

The Civil War legislation changed the course of American tariff history, and at the same time injected new elements which strengthened the

position of protectionists. War revenue measures required the taxing of about everything that promised income for the Government. A comprehensive system of internal taxes was developed. As a result, it became necessary to greatly increase duties on imports, otherwise the heavily taxed domestic industries would have been at serious disadvantage in competing with foreign exporters. At this time most of the tariff measures were hastily drafted and were looked upon as emergency legislation, although, even in the war period, there was considerable protectionist sentiment in Congress. In the decade following the close of the Civil War most internal duties were repealed, but little or nothing was done to reduce the tariff. In the course of time manufacturers began to claim a vested interest in protection; many persons came to look upon this policy as settled procedure in the United States. Many of the political battles from 1880 to the present have been fought partly, at least, on the issue of protection versus free, or freer, trade.

Although since the Civil War the United States has cast its lot with protection, a surprisingly large percentage of foreign goods are admitted duty free. In large measure this is due to the fact that the United States, notably since 1900, has become a great importer of raw materials⁷⁰ which do not compete with domestic commodities. Here and there, foreign raw stuffs which are not identical with our own, but which may be used as substitutes in manufacture, are subjected to duty. Certain vegetable oils are in this class. Nevertheless, the larger proportion of foreign goods pay no duty. As an annual average from 1861 to 1865 about 18% of the imports were duty free. The annual average from 1871 to 1900 was about 36%, and for the years since 1900 about 57%. In fact, in 1930, 66.6% of the imports were free from duty.

Over the years protection has been supported by various lines of reasoning, each dominant argument fitting more or less the peculiar needs of the time. Some classic arguments of Alexander Hamilton have lost weight because of change of conditions, as for example, that tariffs were needed to stimulate foreign investments and to encourage immigration⁷¹. The infant industry argument, however, still persists. Occasionally it is stated that protection is a military necessity. During the depression, after 1929, President Hoover urged that we needed protection to defend industries and trade against the unfortunate effects of depreciated currencies abroad. Many persons still maintain that protection guards American wage levels and American standards of living⁷².

Protestant Episcopal Church

[F. W. Taussig, *The Tariff History of the United States*; Davis R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*.]

ISAAC LIPPINCOTT

Protection of American Citizens Abroad. See Extraterritoriality, Right of, Intervention, American Policy of.

Protective War Claims Association, THE, one of the first of many similar organizations, began operations in 1863 in New York and Philadelphia under the sponsorship of the United States Sanitary Commission⁷³. It was formed to assist in settling claims of soldiers, sailors and their relatives, and to prevent imposture, fraud and false claims. Prominent men, including Gen. Scott, Henry W. Bellows, Hamilton Fish, John Jacob Astor and Peter Cooper, were active in its management.

[*United States Sanitary Commission Bulletin*, No. 3, 1864-65.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Protestant Episcopal Church is the name adopted after the Revolution by the body formerly known as the Church of England in the Colonies⁷⁴. Its first task when the war closed was to develop a national organization and obtain the episcopal succession. The latter objective was secured by the consecration of Samuel Seabury, of Connecticut, by Scottish bishops in 1784 and the consecration by English bishops of William White of Pennsylvania and Samuel Provoost of New York in 1787 and of James Madison of Virginia in 1790. A general convention, organized under the leadership of William White and William Smith, succeeded in uniting the whole church under one government in 1789.

During the years following, the Episcopal Church recovered slowly from the wounds of war until 1811, when a period of active revival began which brought it, by 1850, to sixth place among American denominations, the position it still holds. This was also a period of important institutional growth. The first seminary of the church was established in 1817, and a general missionary society was formed in 1820. Between 1810 and 1830, Sunday schools⁷⁵ were started in most parishes. The winning of the Low Church party by the Evangelicals made that section of the church sympathetic to revivalism⁷⁶, though the High Churchmen opposed it.

The Oxford (Tractarian) Movement⁷⁷, an effort to restore Catholic ideals in the church, began in England in 1833 and came to America during the 1840's, gradually superseding the old High Church party and intensifying party conflict. After the Civil War, at the close of which the northern and southern parts of the church,

necessarily divided by secession, were quickly reunited, the ecclesiastical controversy became yet more bitter when the younger Tractarians sought to introduce ritualistic practices in harmony with their doctrinal position.

The dispute culminated in the withdrawal of some Evangelicals to organize the Reformed Episcopal Church in 1873 and the passage of an antiritual canon by the general convention of 1874. The canon was never enforced and the controversy died down in the decades following, partly because the formation of a strong liberal group was directing the attention of the church to other issues, notably, social reform, church unity and the critical study of the Bible. After 1890 these objectives began to engage the interest of the Anglo-Catholics also, so that during the present century the church has shown a tendency toward unity upon a program of conservative liberalism in respect both to theological and social questions.

[W. S. Perry, *History of the American Episcopal Church, and Historical Notes Illustrating the Organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church*; W. W. Manross, *History of the American Episcopal Church*.]

W. W. MANROSS

Protracted Meeting, THE, was especially common during the 19th century in the rural districts of the South and West where it is still sometimes found. It probably originated much earlier, however, and existed at times in nearly every part of the country. It often partook of the nature of the revival^q, though was somewhat different since its purpose was not only to create a rebirth of religious fervor and swell the ranks of church members but also to provide the religious people of a community with spiritual food and social contacts. It was usually held in the late summer during the period of leisure existing between the cultivation and the harvesting of crops. It was generally conducted by some well-known minister assisted by local pastors. Services were held each evening commonly in the open under a large arbor. After hymns had been sung and prayers offered, the leader delivered the sermon, and then called for sinners to come forward to the "mourner's bench"^q to be prayed for. During these prayers "personal workers" would plead with them to confess their sins and accept salvation. This often continued for several hours. It sometimes resembled the camp meeting^q if attended by many people from a distance. It usually lasted two or three weeks, closing only when attendance and interest began to lag.

[Everett Dick, *The Sod House Frontier*; Guion Griffis Johnson, *The Camp Meeting in Ante Bellum North Carolina*, in *The North Carolina Historical Review*, Vol. X.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Providence, Divine. See Divine Providences.

Providence Island Company (1630-41) was incorporated for the purpose of colonizing the islands of Providence, Henrietta and Association in the Caribbean, a location chosen because of the opportunities it offered for illicit trade and buccaneering in the near-by Spanish colonies. Its promoters were wealthy and aristocratic English Puritans, many of whom, like the Earl of Warwick, were also connected with Puritan colonization projects on the American continent. Though profit was their objective, they were also interested in founding a colony for Puritans. The company, like its predecessors, the Virginia^q and Bermuda companies, financed its plantation by means of a joint stock held by adventurers and planters, the capital and profits to remain undistributed for seven years. From the outset the undertaking failed to prosper. Soil and climate were unfavorable, and the location of the colony in the heart of Spanish territory was a constant source of danger. After 1635 the company expanded its program by attempting to colonize on the mainland of Central America. Since its leaders in England were no longer in sympathy with the Puritans in Massachusetts, they now tried to divert to Providence Island English Puritans planning to go to New England, and even to transplant to the islands New England Puritans who found the atmosphere in that region uncongenial. A group headed by John Humphry left Massachusetts in 1641 to settle in Providence, but shortly before its arrival the colony was conquered by a Spanish expedition.

[A. P. Newton, *The Colonizing Activities of the English Puritans*.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

Providence Plantations is the original name for the first colonial settlement in Rhode Island, made by Roger Williams in June, 1636, and so called for "God's providence to him in his distress," after he fled from Massachusetts to escape persecution. Williams bought a large tract of land from the Indians, and in 1638 associated with himself twelve other settlers as a land company. A covenant was drawn up in 1637 providing for majority rule "only in civill things," that is, for religious liberty. The first home lots were laid out along the present North Main Street of Providence. Under the parliamentary charter of 1644 (see Rhode Island, Colonial Charters of), Providence was joined with Newport and Portsmouth as "The Incorporation of Providence Plantations in the Narragansett Bay in New England." A communal gristmill was established by John Smith in 1646. Thirty years later, during

King Philip's War⁹⁹, the growing town of 1000 people suffered severely from Indian attack. Although not as important a center of colonial commerce as Newport⁹⁹, Providence began to develop wharves and warehouses in 1680. The city's first newspaper, the *Providence Gazette*, was established in 1762 by William Goddard, and in 1770 Rhode Island College (Brown University⁹⁹) moved there from Warren. The term "Providence Plantations" still remains as part of the official title of the State of Rhode Island.

[W. A. Greene, *The Providence Plantation for Two Hundred and Fifty Years.*]

JARVIS M. MORSE

Provincetown Players, the most distinguished American Little Theater group, first produced plays in 1915 in Provincetown, Mass. Discovery of Eugene O'Neill and the production during two summers of numerous successful dramas inspired the establishment of the Playwrights' Theater in Greenwich Village, New York City. Though the movement was essentially co-operative, George Cram Cook, dominant and adventurous, was its leader. Its great days ended in 1922 when the success of *The Emperor Jones* took O'Neill uptown, and when Cook and Susan Glaspell sailed for Greece, but two later groups carried on until 1929.

[Helen Deutsch and Stella Hanau, *The Provincetown*; Susan Glaspell, *The Road to the Temple*; O. M. Saylor, *Our American Theater.*]

DOROTHY DONDORE

Provincial Congresses. The extralegal, or revolutionary, assemblies that sprang up in most of the colonies in the earlier stages of the American Revolution⁹⁹ and became the agencies whereby the transition was effected from dependent colony to independent state are generally known as "provincial congresses," although in some instances the term "convention" was used. Some colonies preferred one, some the other. Distinct connotations seemed not yet to have crystallized, although there was some donning and doffing of the one title or the other, as if making a distinction. The word "convention" had had its part in the long struggle against autocratic power, but "congress," long used in the colonies to designate occasional or irregular assemblages of delegates or agents for purposes of a conference, was the more familiar term, if not also the more adaptable to these new purposes. New Hampshire, Massachusetts and North Carolina inclined to the title "provincial congress"; Virginia uniformly called its extraordinary assemblies "conventions"; New York used both titles at different times. In any case, however, for the last of the revolutionary assemblies, that upon which devolved, by virtue of

its call or of its own decision, the task of formulating a system of government, the name convention was generally employed, the name which has become the accepted designation of a constitution forming body.

These congresses or conventions had various though similar origins. For the most part they were generated by or through the local committees, which flourished in the towns and counties of every colony (*see* Committees of Correspondence; Committees of Safety). In some instances the colonial assembly⁹⁹ was the promoting agency. In Massachusetts, for instance, the assembly merely transformed itself into a provincial congress. Virginia pursued a similar course. In several other cases the assembly, shorn of participation by governor and council, became virtually a provincial congress without change of name. Rhode Island and Connecticut, for instance, effected their transformation under their old charters.

The earliest of these colonial gatherings (they were recorded under a variety of titles, including such as "general meeting," "meeting of the principal gentlemen," etc.) were called together primarily for the purpose of choosing delegates to the proposed Continental Congress⁹⁹ (September, 1774); the next for the similar purpose of choosing delegates to the second Continental Congress (May, 1775), to take action on the proposed "Association,"⁹⁹ in general, and to take into consideration the parlous state of affairs. The Continental Congress, in its turn, further promoted the provincial congresses by tentatively advising certain of them (New Hampshire, South Carolina and Virginia, on Nov. 3, 4 and Dec. 4, 1775, respectively) to set up their own governments; then on May 10, 1776, urging that counsel upon all of them.

To a greater or less degree that very process had meanwhile been going on. First called as advisory rather than as lawmaking bodies, these provincial congresses had already severed virtually every strand of British authority, and, presumably as representatives of the sovereign people, had little by little taken over the functions of government, either directly or through committees of safety of their own creation. It remained but for them definitely to set up their own systems of government; and upon this task, from the adoption of the Declaration of Independence⁹⁹, every colony, now an independent state, became busily engaged.

[J. F. Jameson, *Early Political Uses of the Word Convention*, in *American Antiquarian Society's Proceedings*, XII; A. C. McLaughlin, *A Constitutional History of the United States*; A. M. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Mer-*

chants and the American Revolution; Richard Frothingham, *Rise of the Republic*.]

EDMUND C. BURNETT

Prudhomme Bluffs (Écores Prudhomme) is synonymous with the Third Chickasaw Bluffs, about 150 miles below the mouth of the Ohio. Being a strategic point on the Mississippi, it was the site of a fort erected by LaSalle^{re} in 1682, and of a new Spanish fort occupied shortly before 1795, though the position was not fortified continuously during the intervening period.

[John Senex, *A Map of Louisiana and of the River Mississippi*, 1721; William Delisle, *Carte de la Louisiane et du Cours du Mississippi*, 1718; Philip M. Hamer, *Tennessee: A History, 1673-1932*; John W. Monette, *History of the Discovery and Settlement of the Valley of the Mississippi*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Prussia, Treaties with. In 1785 the United States made a treaty with Prussia which embodied the principles of the Plan of 1776^{re} plus additional principles of the so-called Plan of 1784 which latter provided for pre-emption rather than confiscation of defined contraband and, in case of war between the two treaty parties, considerate treatment of enemy aliens and their property within each enemy's domains. The treaty was renewed with some alterations in 1799 and 1828 and continued until the World War.

[Hunter Miller, *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States*; Carlton Savage, *Policy of the United States toward Maritime Commerce in War*, I; Edwin E. Borchard, *The Effect of War on the Treaty of 1828 with Prussia*, in *American Journal of International Law*, XXVI.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

"Public Be Damned." On Sunday afternoon, Oct. 8, 1882, as a N. Y. Central R. R.^{re} train bearing W. H. Vanderbilt, president of the road, was approaching Chicago, two newspaper reporters boarded the train and interviewed Mr. Vanderbilt on various phases of the railroad situation. In the course of the interview Mr. Vanderbilt was asked concerning his plan to meet the "express passenger" service just inaugurated by the Pennsylvania Railroad^{re}. Vanderbilt remarked that such service did not pay expenses, and to a question about "the public benefit," is reported to have replied, "The public be damned," adding that the public's only interest in the railroads was to get as much out of them as possible for the least consideration. Mr. Vanderbilt did not know how the interview had been reported until it was printed in the *New York Times* and other papers, whereupon he wired the *Times* denying that he had used the "language reported," stating that "both my words and ideas are misreported and misrepre-

sented." The reporters, however, alleged that Vanderbilt's language had been reported correctly and stood willing to "make affidavits as to the correctness of their reports." Publication of the interview caused widespread critical comment.

[*New York Times*, Oct. 9, 10, 13, 1882; *New York Herald*, Oct. 12 and 14, 1882.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Public Credit Act, THE, followed Alexander Hamilton's Report on Public Credit of Jan. 9, 1790. The main provisions were: the paying of the government's obligations at par with interest (except the Continental Currency, which was to be redeemed 100 to 1 in specie), the assumption of the state debts^{re} for services or supplies during the war; and the authorization of loans to meet these obligations. The act was approved Aug. 4, 1790. To get the act passed the Federal Capital was located in the District of Columbia (*see* Compromises of the Federal Constitution). The act helped get the support of the security holders for the new Government.

[D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Public Domain, THE, is to be distinguished from the national domain. The former term pertains to land owned by the Government, the latter not at all to ownership but to political jurisdiction. By public domain we mean in this country the Federal domain, land owned by the Federal Government, although all of our states have, and many still do, own a great deal of land.

The public domain thus defined originally amounted to about one and a third billion acres of land, or just over two thirds of the entire United States territory. The other third at one time or another belonged for the most part to the states. The most important exception to this statement would be the land belonging to colonization companies or to individuals by direct grant from the king. The Federal Government owned virtually no land in the form of public domain in any of the thirteen colonies, or in the states of Vermont, Maine, Kentucky, Tennessee or Texas.

The original part of this vast domain was obtained by the cession of Western lands^{re} claimed by seven of the original states. This put into the hands of the Federal Government the territory westward to the Mississippi, excepting Kentucky and Tennessee, which had already received their lands from their respective parent states. The next great acquisition was the territory of Louisiana^{re} purchased from France in 1803, and comprising nearly 40% of the present continental

United States. Then came the Floridas, the Oregon territory, the Mexican cession and the Gadsden Purchase⁹⁹. These several acquisitions are shown in the following table:

SUMMARY OF THE ACQUISITION OF THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Acquisitions	Date	Land Surface Area Added to the National Domain	Private Claims	Purchase Price
		<i>sq. miles</i>	<i>acres</i>	
Cession by States.....	1781 to 1802	406,219	2,249,711.3
Louisiana Purchase.	1803	842,760	6,379,007.8	\$27,267,621.98
Purchase of the Floridas.....	1819	54,861	2,778,942.6	6,489,768.00
Annexation of Texas and the Texas Cession.....	1845 and 1850	383,463	6,525,712.2	16,000,000.00
Acquisition of the Oregon Territory .	1846	264,096	2,937,636.7
Acquisition of the Territory from Mexico	1848	529,169	13,674,670.8	15,000,000.00
Gadsden Purchase	1853	22,762	59,146.4	10,000,000.00
Total.....		2,503,330	34,604,827.8	\$74,757,389.98

There were two contending views concerning the disposition of this public domain. (Including state-owned land, which was likewise a kind of public domain, the proportion governmentally owned was much beyond two thirds of the total national domain.) The Federal Government was in need of money—the land appeared to be a valuable, saleable, asset. Thus one party, headed by Hamilton, wanted to sell the land for all it would bring. The other view, held by Jefferson, was that the land belonged to the people and should be given to them at little or no charge. The financial view seemed to win the day, and until 1841 an attempt was made to sell at as high a figure as any one would pay (*see* Public Land Sales). Then came a compromise which gave the settlers a great advantage over the speculators. This was the Pre-emption Act, the forerunner of the Homestead Act⁹⁹ of twenty years later.

In the meantime much had been happening to the public domain aside from sale to settlers. Grants of various kinds ran into huge proportions. The first in origin was for education. This comprised generous amounts of land for common schools, universities and colleges, aggregating over 100,000,000 acres (*see* Land Grants for Education). Grants for internal improvements⁹⁹ began with modest amounts given to men who established ferries over the larger rivers. Soon land bonuses were given to the builders of wagon roads. From these concessions the transition to the public support of canals (*see* Canal Lands) and river improvement was easy and natural. After having given a few million acres for the support of these specific enterprises Congress undertook to handle the matter in a more gen-

eral fashion, and granted to the states within which public land was located a half million acres of land to be used under state direction for the promotion of public enterprises coming un-

der the title, Internal Improvements. However, the demands for railroads were so great that in addition to grants made by states out of the half million apportionments Congress made many princely grants directly (*see* Land Grants to Railways). All counted, the railroads received from the Federal and state governments, out of the Federal domain, not far from 130,000,000 acres of land to be used in promoting the building of their lines. The period of these liberal grants stretched from about 1823 to 1879.

The Homestead Act of 1862 was hailed as the happy culmination of nearly a century of land legislation and struggle. It was designed for and adapted to the upper Mississippi Valley: such as western Iowa, southern Minnesota, the eastern portions of the Plains States. For this region it was all that it was intended to be. However, it was carried into the arid regions, applied to the forests, and in fact was available almost without restriction for acquiring any land valuable as natural scenery, strategic points on waterfronts, or mountain passes, while at the same time land with no discernible value was offered to the unsuspecting settler, who, in all too many cases, suffered beyond measure in trying to make good his right to a piece of the public domain. Many acts were passed designed to correct the evils of the Homestead Act, as applied to the arid, and rough lands of the West. Among these may be mentioned: The Desert Land Act, 1877; the Timber Culture Act, 1873⁹⁹; the Timber and Stone Act, 1878; the Reclamation Act, 1902⁹⁹; the Kinkaid Act, 1904⁹⁹. These are the leading instances of attempts to remedy a matter which was becoming worse from year to year.

Somewhat tardily the people of the country woke up to the necessity of facing the issue realistically. The public domain, much depleted in quantity, but by no means gone, should be made to serve the people of the country in the best way possible. Laissez faire had been given a free hand, and had done, so far as much of the country was concerned, badly. Out of this movement the country succeeded in salvaging an important remnant of the forest land in the form of National Forest^{er} Reserves. A start has been made in controlled grazing, within national forests, and outside. The Grazing Homestead Act of 1916, an act of doubtful wisdom, put a large quantity of semiarid land into homesteaders' hands on the supposition that they could make a living on 640 acres. Most of these tracts have been absorbed into larger and more adequate holdings.

There is but a fragment of the public domain left in public hands, not far from 162,000,000 acres. The most of this is so poor that nobody would take it as a gift on a homestead basis. There is a somewhat larger acreage, 175,000,000 acres, contained in the national forests. Much of this is grazing land, with little or no forest cover. Many millions of acres of land, mainly poor in quality, are owned by the states. This was originally granted to the states by the general Government, and such as was desirable was sold to individuals. Another important amount of land, a new public domain, consists of 50,000,000 acres of land which has been acquired by states and counties through tax delinquency.

[L. C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in Southern United States to 1860*; B. H. Hibbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies*; P. J. Treat, *The National Land System*; Thomas Donaldson, *Public Domain*; *Annual Reports of the General Land Office*; *Yearbook of Agriculture*.]

BENJAMIN HORACE HIBBARD

Public Faith is a term which is frequently used to express the confidence of the general public in the bonds, notes and other obligations of the United States. A high degree of public faith in government obligations was early established under the administration of George Washington with Alexander Hamilton as Secretary of the Treasury. Hamilton was well aware of the advantages of strict financial integrity in the National Government and was largely responsible for the passage of legislation for funding certain previously incurred obligations of the states and the Continental Congress^{er} (see Assumption of, and Funding of, Revolutionary Debt).

The integrity of the United States with respect to its obligations was thereafter consistently maintained until 1933. Even during the Civil War period, when the currency of the country

was not redeemable in gold, the Government maintained gold payments on its bonds, obtaining the necessary funds from customs duties which were payable in gold.

Under the Joint Resolution of June 5, 1933, the gold clause was abrogated in all contracts, public and private. The refusal of the Government to pay its own obligations, bearing the gold clause, in gold (or its equivalent) was a distinct breach of the public faith and was declared unconstitutional in the gold-clause cases^{er} in February, 1935.

[D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Public Health Movement, THE. See Health, Public.

"Public Interest, Clothed (or Affected) with a," is a term applied to businesses which may be subjected to government regulation^{er}, particularly in matters of price control. The term was first imported into the constitutional law of the United States in 1877, in the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Munn v. Illinois*^{er} (94 U. S. 113). It describes businesses subject to regulation from their inception because intimately related to the public welfare, and those which owe their existence to some government grant. More important, perhaps, it applies to businesses not originally of such interest to the public as to justify regulation, but which need to be regulated because of changed conditions. The highly controversial question as to when a business becomes so clothed with a public interest as to justify regulation is one for the courts. A recent significant pronouncement was in 1934, in *Nebbia v. New York*^{er} (291 U. S. 502).

[John M. Mathews, *The American Constitutional System*; Dexter M. Keezer and Stacy May, *The Public Control of Business*.]

CARL BRENT SWISHER

Public Land Sales. As soon as the Government found itself in possession of a public domain^{er} it set about the disposal of it. The first quantities disposed of went to the soldiers as military bounty^{er}. This took but a small amount during the early years, and the question as to sales soon came to the front. Jefferson and other idealists had hoped that the land might be given away; but the extreme need for revenue converted even these humanitarians to the advisability of disposing of the land for a consideration. The plan of selling might seem to be a matter of great simplicity; but a surprising number of diverse, even complicated, plans soon arose. Should the land be sold where it really was, on the frontier, or

should it be sold at the Federal Capital? Should it be sold in farm-sized tracts, or in big blocks to companies, or individuals, who in turn would break it up into small tracts such as settlers wanted, and sell it to the latter? Should it be sold for cash or on time; at a stipulated price, or at auction? Should all of one large tract be sold before other lands were offered? Was it possible to sell land before it was surveyed? These, and many more, questions came up.

The first plan of sale adopted provided that the land be sold at the Federal Capital, at auction, in relatively large tracts. First a township, six miles square, was to be sold entire, excluding, however, section 16, reserved for schools. After this was taken another township was to be offered in sections of 640 acres; after this second township was all sold the same routine was to be repeated, whole townships and the full thirty-six sections of the next to be sold alternately. This plan did not work at all well. Little land was sold except two large tracts, aggregating over 1,000,000 acres. Hardly more than three townships were sold on the basis of the main plan, and this partly on time. Within the next few years the size of tract offered was much reduced, reaching its present figure of forty acres in 1832.

The minimum price at first was but a dollar an acre, with the hope that at auction it would go at a much higher price. The results were disappointing, the early sales averaging \$1.60. In 1796 the minimum price was raised to \$2.00, with some credit privileges for one year (*see Land Act of 1796*). Still land did not sell readily. Next came a final concession in the way of credit. Beginning in 1800 credit extending over a four-year period was allowed (*see Harrison Land Act*). Under this act the sales were disappointingly small, while worse yet the payments due under the credit arrangement failed to be made.

The first successful land-sales act was passed in 1820 (*see Land Act of 1820*), and provided for cash sale at a minimum of \$1.25 an acre. Under this act something like the equivalent area of Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan was sold. The land was sold at auction, yet it seldom brought more than the \$1 25 minimum price.

Although the cash sale price was low, the settlers were not satisfied until, in 1862, they induced Congress to make land free, under the Homestead Act⁹⁷.

Under the open cash sale at auction several difficulties were encountered. To begin with there was no restriction on amounts purchased, and speculation, in consequence, ran riot. For example, during the decade preceding the Civil

War one man bought 344,000 acres of land in Iowa.

A circumstance of much importance developed during the open sales period. It happened that settlers took up land as "squatters"⁹⁸ ahead of the surveys (*see Public Lands, Survey of*), and therefore ahead of the time when the land was offered for sale. It was not unusual for such settlers to hold this land for a considerable number of years, make improvements worth hundreds of dollars, and then find themselves in danger of losing the farm by being outbid by a speculator with enough money to outbid them and get the land with its improvements at a figure below its value, since a pioneer farmer could not well buy his "claim," i.e., the tract of land, and at the same time pay the Government for the improvements which he had put, at his own expense, on the land. The result of trouble of this kind was that the settlers banded themselves together into Claim Associations⁹⁹ and prevented outsiders from intervening at the time of the auction. Furthermore, they did not bid on such claims more than the minimum price.

The demands of the frontiersmen resulted, in 1841, in the Pre-emption Act¹⁰⁰ of that date, which secured to each settler who took up land ahead of the time of sale, and who made improvements, the right to the first chance to buy such land when it was offered for sale. On this basis a vast amount of land was put into the hands of the actual settlers, at the minimum price.

After 1862 the Homestead was much more important than outright sale as a means of obtaining government land. The transactions are somewhat obscured by the fact that land taken under the Pre-emption Act, which continued until 1891, was reported as land sold. Also under the Homestead Act it was possible to commute, i.e., to buy the land at \$1.25 after fulfilling the requirements of the Pre-emption Act. Thus there were many sales which ran into big figures even after 1862, but as one of the primary means of disposing of the public domain the sale method pertains to the period before that date. Not far from 175,000,000 acres were sold before 1862; somewhat over 125,000,000 acres since that time.

[Thomas Donaldson, *Public Domain*; General Land Office Reports; Public Lands Commission, *Report of 1904*; L. C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in Southern United States to 1860*; B. H. Hubbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies*.]

BENJAMIN HORACE HIBBARD

Public Land States. The twenty-nine states which were created out of the public domain¹⁰¹, and in which all original titles to land came from the Federal Government, are called public land

states. After the admission of these states into the Union the Federal Government continued to manage the lands but granted to the states various amounts for specific purposes such as education, drainage, internal improvements and construction of public buildings. In these states are found the characteristic features of the Federal land system such as rectangular surveys, auction sales, pre-emption, graduation, homestead, timber-culture entries and common-school sections. Not included are the thirteen original states and Vermont, Maine, Kentucky, Tennessee, Texas and West Virginia, which managed their own lands. Until 1911 national forests were restricted to public land states.

[B. H. Hubbard, *A History of Public Land Policies.*]

PAUL WALLACE GATES

Public Lands. See Public Domain.

Public Lands, Fencing of. The range cattle^o industry on the Great Plains was based on the use of the public domain^o for grazing purposes. There was no serious objection to this practice as long as the range remained open and the country was not wanted by settlers. After the invention of barbed wire^o during the 1870's, however, complaints began to pour in to the Commissioner of the General Land Office that illegal inclosures of public land were being made. By this means land companies were able to control large ranges, including streams and other watering places, and keep other cattlemen out. Settlers were also demanding access to the land, and fence-cutters' wars^o were of frequent occurrence.

A series of investigations revealed a startling situation. In 1884 the Commission reported thirty-two cases of illegal fencing. One inclosure contained 600,000 acres; another 40 townships; one cattleman had 250 miles of fence. Investigations during the succeeding years showed a rapid increase of illegal fencing, until 531 inclosures were reported in 1888, involving more than 7,000,000 acres of public domain. Congressional legislation and a presidential proclamation in 1885 ordered the removal of the fences, but it was not until 1889 that any real progress was made in eliminating the illegal practice.

[*Annual Reports* of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, 1884-1890; Louis Pelzer, *The Cattlemen's Frontier.*]

DAN E. CLARK

Public Lands, Survey of. The first settlers in America measured out their lands for individual or public holdings on the basis of "metes and bounds,"^o the shape of the tracts being determined by any convenient circumstance pertaining to the particular tract, such as the shore

lines of ocean, lakes or rivers; the ridges of hills and mountains; or even the desirability of certain land as compared with other adjoining land. The lack of system permitted the first settlers to pick and choose to an almost unlimited degree. There had been in Europe some attempt at regular surveys, but they did not predominate, and were not introduced at all promptly in America.

The colonies had begun a system of surveys for outlining towns, Massachusetts attempting to lay them out in six-mile square tracts. Connecticut had likewise attempted a five-mile square town. The square town, or township^o, was, in a small way, attempted in South Carolina. To indicate further that the idea of a rectangular system of surveys was not altogether new in 1785, it may be noted that several land schemes provided for the "township" system of subdivision soon after the middle of the 18th century.

The difficulties connected with the indiscriminate surveys of most colonies, especially the Southern, including both Kentucky and Tennessee, had impressed a large number of men interested in a feasible system of measurements and designations, with the desirability of a rectangular survey. In the debate on this subject many objections were brought forth. The genuine objections were such as those pertaining to cutting across streams, valleys and ridges in undesirable and awkward ways, shutting one division off from a suitable building site, another from a watercourse; giving all of one kind of land to one tract, and all of another kind to another tract.

Our present rectangular survey was adopted as a feature of the Ordinance of 1785^o. It provides for the survey of all public land into townships six miles square (see *Seven Ranges, The, Survey of*). The townships are numbered both ways, to the north and the south, from certain east and west "Base Lines" (see *Geographer's Line*). Certain meridians are designated as "Primary" meridians. Lying parallel to these meridians a north-and-south row of townships is called a "range." Such rows are numbered both to the east and to the west of the "Primary" meridians. A township is divided into thirty-six sections, each a mile square, and numbered from the northeastern corner toward the west, forth and back, bringing number thirty-six to the southeastern corner. This system applies, with a few local exceptions, to all states of the Union except the thirteen original states and Vermont, Maine, Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia and Texas, the last-named state having a similar system of her own.

Under this system it is possible to designate a certain forty-acre tract of land with a few words and numbers. The designation is absolutely definite and could not apply to any other land whatever. For instance, a tract of land numbered: Sec. 10; T. 94 N.; R. 40 west of the Fifth Principal Meridian could be found nowhere else than in northwestern Iowa. The Fifth Principal Meridian runs north from the mouth of the Arkansas River in Arkansas. The "Base Line" governing this part of the country runs west from the mouth of the St. Francis River in the same state. Thus the particular Section 10 designated will be found in the 94th township to the north of this base line, and in the 40th one to the west of the line designated as the Fifth Principal Meridian.

The rectangular survey system, with all its inaccuracies, is a system of great convenience, and, even though we did not literally devise the system, our use of it established its acceptance over a large portion of the newer parts of the world.

[Thomas Donaldson, *The Public Domain*, 1884; B. H. Hibbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies*; Payson J. Treat, *The National Land System, 1785-1820*.]

BENJAMIN HORACE HIBBARD

Public Opinion is a term used to describe the attitudes of individuals in groups toward other individuals, groups, or objects. By "attitude" is meant a predisposition to act in a particular way with reference to a given person, group, object, or situation. It is well to distinguish individual opinion, even though uttered in public, from public opinion. The former remains essentially personal, unless it represents the attitude of a significant group. The "public" has been variously defined as: (1) those who are affected by the acts of others; (2) organized groups which are able to influence public policy; (3) those upon whom the incidence of governmental action falls; and (4) the interested spectators to action. Most authorities recognize not one but many publics—as many as there are attitude-holding groups. These may be classified as to location in time or space, economic or social status, physical traits, intellectual capacities, religion, race, nationality and so forth. Since opinions are invariably expressed in symbolic form, i.e., words, pictures and diagrams, publics may conveniently be classified in terms of their unifying symbols or slogans, viz., Republican, Jew, Catholic, American, New Deal, the World to the Workers, or Make the World Safe for Democracy. These help to identify and/or to express the private wishes or fears of those who make up the public to which the symbols or slogans relate. As such they

serve as the basis for united action and as shortcuts to understanding.

Wilhelm Bauer distinguishes "static" from "dynamic" public opinion. The former manifests itself in traditional customs and usages, is particularly evident in homogeneous agrarian economies, and is ordinarily accepted without discussion or debate. Dynamic opinion is built on the arts of persuasion and systematic publicity, flourishes in heterogeneous urban communities, and is characterized by debatable demands for action (*see* Pressure Groups). A public opinion may be permanent (the defense of democracy) or temporary (the boosting of a favorite son). It may be general ("Buy American") or specific ("block that kick"). It may be the result of indirect propaganda⁷⁷ (the struggle of public utilities against public ownership) or of a direct campaign (as with commercial advertising). It may have been created consciously (as by a public-relations counsel) or unintentionally (as when the movies or schools affect attitudes toward Negroes, Chinese, trade-unions or a big navy). Whatever its form, it consists of the attitudes of some group toward some other object, person, group, policy or institution.

Throughout the major portion of human history static public opinion has been the major factor in governing human conduct. Dynamic opinion, however, characterized Periclean Athens with its lyceums, academies and theaters, its philosophers, dramatists and artists. To a less extent this was also true of the Roman Republic. During the Middle Ages, except in a few centers, the atmosphere of opinion was one of unchallenged faith in revealed dogmas, static and unchanging. The invention of the printing press aided greatly in breaking through this "cake of custom" and in the revival of a dynamic public opinion. In its modern democratic form public opinion may be traced to the struggles for political and religious liberty in the 17th and 18th centuries. Both the American and French Revolutions relied on pamphleteering to maintain morale, cement loyalty and insure popular support. In the 19th century the rise of national consciousness, the spread of elementary education, the development of modern methods of communication and the progressive democratization of political institutions increased immeasurably the importance of public opinion. Agencies of mass impression⁷⁸ have multiplied until in the United States, for example, there are 2000 daily newspapers, 6300 weekly papers, 700 religious publications, 2500 class and trade publications, 6000 new books a year, 200,000 billboards, 600 radio stations and 26,000,000 radio sets, 232,000

churches, 16,800,000 telephones, 14,500 women's clubs, and 22,000 movies with a capacity of 11,300,000. So all-pervasive are these opinion-creating devices that it is literally true for most people that all they know is what they read in the newspapers, hear on the radio, or see in the movies⁹⁹. In democratic and nondemocratic countries alike, public opinion is the one chief force binding together the governors and the governed.

[Norman Angell, *The Public Mind*; John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems*; W. Brooke Graves, *Readings in Public Opinion*; Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion*; A. L. Lowell, *Public Opinion and Popular Government*, and *Public Opinion in War and Peace*; Peter H. Odegard, *The American Public Mind*; William Albis, *Public Opinion*.]

PETER H. ODEGARD
DONALD BISHOP

Public Ownership. The controversy with regard to public ownership usually centers around the so-called public utilities⁹⁹, and in this field, though there is much agitation in favor of public ownership, private enterprise is the rule.

In the developmental stage of public utilities it was the commonly accepted view that business undertakings should be conducted by private enterprise; and as private capital was generally available whenever there was a reasonable prospect of a satisfactory profit, the public utilities, at the outset, were usually privately owned and operated. Toward the close of the 19th century, however, there developed a strong public-ownership movement. The growth of population and the increasing urbanization⁹⁹ of society led to a rapid expansion of public-utility services, which were seen to be indispensable in modern community life. Experience taught that competition, upon which reliance had been placed, did not function satisfactorily; and opposition arose to monopolistic control of indispensable utility services. Control of the monopolies by means of franchises⁹⁹ was attempted, but with little success. Accordingly many people came to believe that the municipalities should acquire and operate public-utility systems. The movement toward public ownership would doubtless have developed greater strength had it not been for the creation, subsequent to 1907, of state and Federal public-service commissions, with broad powers of regulation (*see* Public Utilities, Regulation of). For a time regulation was widely believed to offer the solution to the problem, but regulation in practice has not proved altogether satisfactory, and accordingly the movement for public ownership has gained new impetus.

Despite the growing dissatisfaction with regulation, there is very little public ownership except in the supplying of water and electrical en-

ergy. As regards water, in the early days the water-works systems were usually privately operated (*see* Water Supply for Cities). Thus in 1800 only one of the seventeen plants was public. At the present time, however, at least nine tenths of the people in municipalities having water-works facilities are supplied by public works. In the field of electric light and power⁹⁹ more than half of the establishments are municipal, but the municipal plants are small, as a rule, and they generate only about 5% of the total output of energy. In the gas⁹⁹ industry municipal ownership has not made much headway; less than 5% of the plants are municipally owned. There are municipal street-railway⁹⁹ systems in Detroit, Seattle and San Francisco, and municipal subways in New York, Boston and Philadelphia, but less than 4% of the street railways are municipal. Public ownership of telephones⁹⁹ in this country is almost nonexistent.

The growing dissatisfaction with regulation as a means of dealing with monopolistic utility enterprises has led, in the electric light and power field, to a new experiment—the establishment of Federal agencies to generate, transmit, and in certain cases distribute, electrical energy. The outstanding example is the Tennessee Valley Authority⁹⁹, which has been a storm center of controversy. (*See also* Boulder, or Hoover, Dam; Grand Coulee Dam; Peck, Fort, Dam; Bonneville Dam.)

[Eliot Jones and T. C. Biggam, *Principles of Public Utilities*.]

ELIOT JONES

Public Revenue. *See* Revenue, The Public.

Public Utilities are a more or less well-defined group of persons or industries which over a long period of time have come to be or are now considered as having peculiar duties of serving the public without unjust and unreasonable preference, prejudice or discrimination among those whom they serve for reasonable compensation, and as having certain privileges such as franchises⁹⁹, certificates or other authorization to engage in operation, and sometimes the power of eminent domain⁹⁹. Public utilities or public-service enterprises have come to be considered economically and legally as species of quasi-public servants who perform, for reasonable compensation and subject to public regulation of their services and charges, functions of unique public interest, which if not performed by the utility or public-service enterprises would of necessity be performed by the public collectively through governmental agencies.

The origin of the public utilities as a separate

category of industries may be traced, some authorities believe, to the so-called "common callings" or common employments of the Middle Ages. These callings were numerous and included millers, brewers, hucksters, farriers (horse-shoers), victualers, flipperers (old clothing dealers), taverners, and many other callings by which men were distinguished from others who were engaged principally in agriculture. This ascription of the origin of present-day utilities does not appear to be tenable, however, because there is no evidence that the persons following these callings were under special duty to serve the public generally in these occupations or trades at reasonable or regulated compensation. However, certain occupations such as common carriers of persons or goods were recognized by the Court of King's Bench in England in the 17th century as having duties to serve the public willing to pay their charges with their facilities, as "the custom of England" (*Rich v. Kneeland*, K. B., 1613, Cro. Jac. 330, 79 Reprint 282; *Jackson v. Rodgers*, K. B., 1683, 2 Show. 327, 89 Reprint 968; etc.).

Different types of businesses or services have been recognized at different periods as possessing "public utility characteristics," such as those performing public transportation services for hire, and, by analogy, industries performing services related to those of the transportation utilities or performing auxiliary services. These industries may be said to be "absorbed" into the public-utility category (dissenting opinion of Associate Justice Lamar in *German Alliance Insurance Co. v. Lewis*, 233 U. S. 389, 1914).

The classification appears to be broader than this, however, and in modern times the test appears to be whether or not the business under consideration is, in the light of existing economic, political, social and governmental ideas and ideals, one in which the right of regulation by the public should be or has been asserted (*see Business, Public Control of*). There appears to be a shift from the criterion of historic analogy stressed in 18th and 19th-century court decisions to the test of the need or expediency of public regulation of the industries in the public interest, although the transition from the historical analogy criterion to the test of public sentiment does not appear to be consistently followed by the courts in the last half-century (*see among other decisions Munn v. Illinois*, 94 U. S. 113, 1876; *Budd v. N. Y.*, 143 U. S. 517, 1892; *Wolff etc. v. Kansas*, 262 U. S. 522, 1923; *Tyson etc. v. Blanton*, 273 U. S. 418, 1926; *Nebbia v. N. Y.*, 291 U. S. 502, 1934; *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U. S. 262, 1932; etc.).

Recently there has been a tendency for the courts to wait for legislatures to enact legislation bringing industries under the police regulatory power before passing judicially upon the public-utility status of the industry, although the tendency is not clearly defined (*State v. S. P. and S. R.*, 599 Pac. 1110, 1916). In general it would appear that industries are "affected with a public interest" or "clothed with a public interest"⁹⁰ so as to demark them as public utilities when public sentiment, as reflected in legislation or as expressed in court decisions, sets them apart from other industries and subjects them to extraordinary regulation under the police power⁹¹. The line of demarkation separating public utilities from private industry is an evanescent one, shifting as economic, political and social patterns are altered by the passage of time. The number of industries considered to be public utilities is tending to expand rather than contract in recent years. Some of the factors which tend to increase the number of industries considered as public utilities are: the growth in size and complexity of communities; the increasing complexity of modern urban life; the increasing subdivision of labor; the increasing amounts of capital required by individuals or enterprises to serve the public adequately; the increase in size of certain industries in maintaining public services; the separation of producers and distributors from consumers; the increasing and broadening of the public use of the services; the increasing dependence of the public upon various services; the need for extraordinary corporate powers, such as certificates of public convenience and necessity, franchises and power of eminent domain; the need of certain industries to be protected from competition or from excessive competition; the tendency toward monopoly or quasi-monopoly of certain industries; the depressed economic condition of certain industries; the difficulty experienced by certain industries in dealing with social problems, such as labor relations; and other factors.

Public-utility industries may be divided into several more or less well-defined groups: (1) transportation utilities, including railroads, express carriers, water carriers, highway carriers, air carriers, pipe lines and related industries; (2) communication utilities, including telegraph, telephone, cable and radio communication utilities; (3) storage utilities, including public warehouses, grain elevators and similar enterprises; and (4) "domestic service" utilities, including electric light and power, natural and artificial gas, water supply, sewage, heating and other related service utilities.

There has been a tendency for privately owned and operated public utilities to be taken over by municipal, state or Federal governments for public ownership and operation due to several causes: (1) the competition of public-owned utilities and those owned privately; (2) restrictive regulation or legislation; (3) inability of private capital to obtain funds necessary for construction or expansion of facilities; (4) economic depression which has restricted private funds available for investment; (5) excessive taxation; (6) restrictive rate or service regulation impairing the ability of privately owned utilities to earn a fair return upon the funds invested; (7) abuse of monopoly power or danger of such abuse by privately owned utilities; (8) excessive competition among privately owned public utilities; (9) political activities of certain public utilities; and (10) political policy of the party in control of local, state or National governments.

[G. Lloyd Wilson, J. M. Herring and R. B. Eutsler, *Public Utility Regulation and Public Utility Industries*; Ownership and Regulation of Public Utilities, in *Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 201; John Bauer, *Effective Regulation of Public Utilities*; L. R. Nash, *The Economics of Public Utilities*; W. E. Mosher and F. G. Crawford, *Public Utility Regulation*; Eliot Jones and T. C. Bigham, *Principles of Public Utilities*.]

G. LLOYD WILSON

Public Utilities, Regulation of, prior to 1900, was attempted chiefly through direct legislation, through commissions lacking the power to fix rates, or through franchises⁷⁷ which granted to the utilities certain privileges and which also placed on their activities specific limitations. These methods proved to be ineffective so, in 1907, New York, followed shortly by Wisconsin, set up a new type of regulatory commission. The idea spread rapidly and was generally adopted by the states which set up agencies bearing various titles such as "public service commission" or "public utilities commission." Only Delaware failed to create such a regulatory body. The members of these commissions are presumably experts competent to exercise the special powers delegated to them by the state legislatures. The commissions are authorized to fix rates and to regulate the activities of the monopoly so as to secure adequate service to the public and to maintain proper standards. In most cases the commissions have control over the accounting of utilities and are authorized to require periodic reports. Since they are quasi-judicial as well as quasi-legislative in character, these commissions can proceed against utilities which fail to obey their edicts. Proceedings may be

started either on the complaints of outside parties or on the initiative of the commissions themselves. Hearings must be held, with opportunity for the utilities to be heard, before orders may be issued regarding rates or services. Appeal from these orders generally may be carried to the courts.

When these state commissions were set up, public utilities⁷⁸ were for the the most part local, independent, operating companies which were fairly easy to regulate. Beginning about 1910, however, these local companies fell, in rapidly increasing numbers, under the control of holding companies⁷⁹. By 1929 holding companies controlled over 75% of the total investment in the utilities which were privately owned. One holding company controlled operating companies in as many as twenty different states. In a number of cases there was "pyramided" control, with a holding company controlling several lesser holding companies which, in turn, controlled many operating companies. Under these circumstances the state commissions found it difficult effectively to regulate the public utilities within their jurisdiction, so there arose an insistent demand for Federal regulation.

A preliminary step was taken in 1920 when Congress created the Federal Power Commission⁸⁰, the authority of which was limited to the making of investigations and the compiling of reports concerning water-power resources and the water-power industry. Much more influential in securing Federal regulation was the investigation of utilities carried on by the Federal Trade Commission⁸¹ as a result of a Senate resolution adopted in 1928. A result of this investigation may be seen in the plank in the Democratic platform of 1932 which called for Federal regulation of holding companies selling securities in interstate commerce and also of the rates of utilities which operated in such commerce. Not until 1935 was action taken to carry out these pledges. On Aug. 24 of that year there was passed what is known as the Wheeler-Rayburn Act or, officially, as the Public Utility Act of 1935.

Though the administration insisted that a "death sentence" should be imposed on holding companies, the act did not go to that extreme. Title I did require holding companies to register with the Securities and Exchange Commission⁸² and it provided for the regulation of the issuance of securities, of the acquisition of utility assets and securities, and of "service contracts" and other intercompany transactions. Provision was made for corporate simplification and reorganization as well as for the supervision of

accounts and for the submission of reports by holding companies. The second title of the act authorized the Federal Power Commission to regulate the interstate activities of operating utility companies.

The requirement that holding companies must register with the Securities and Exchange Commission met with much opposition. A test case, known as *Electric Bond and Share Co. et al. v. Securities and Exchange Commission* (303 U. S. 419) was carried to the Supreme Court, which, on March 28, 1939, upheld the validity of the provision by a 6 to 1 vote. The holding company's attorneys claimed that the act was unconstitutional because, among other reasons, it "inseparably" commingled "intrastate and interstate companies and activities" and was an "unlawful delegation of legislative power to the Commission." The highest tribunal held that the company was engaged in interstate commerce and so was "within the reach of congressional power." Registration, requiring the presentation of certain information by holding companies, was a valid procedure, the Court ruled. Since only the registration requirement was at issue, the Court refused to rule on the constitutionality of the remainder of the act. Following this decision, the holding companies had no choice but to register though some were voluntarily dissolved to escape the requirement, which was, of course, but a preliminary to regulation of a more drastic nature.

[John Bauer, *Effective Regulation of Public Utilities*; M. L. Ramsay, *Pyramids of Power*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Public Works Administration. By the National Industrial Recovery Act²⁷ of 1933. Congress, under the leadership of President F. D. Roosevelt, set up the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works to administer an original fund of \$3,300,000,000 for an enormous program of construction on public highways, buildings and parkways; an extensive series of projects regarding conservation and development of natural resources; and a general low-cost housing program. Some of the projects contemplated and eventually undertaken involved prevention of soil erosion, development of water power, flood control, river and harbor improvements—anything, in fact, that was regarded as "in the public interest." Expenditures were made directly by a Federal bureau or through grants-in-aid²⁸ to states and municipalities. Such grants were not to exceed 30% of the cost of labor and materials on such projects, and reasonable security as to repayment was required. The motives behind the act were diverse:

"pump-priming"²⁹ theorists expected that a huge works program would create the necessary spur to business; another group hoped to reduce the more severe fluctuations of the business cycle³⁰ by balancing a decrease in private employment by an increase in public employment; most obviously, the proponents hoped for the immediate relief to be obtained by a "made work" program. In 1937 slum-clearance and low-rent housing projects were transferred to the U. S. Housing Authority and after July, 1939, emphasis was placed upon self-liquidating projects combined with a provision for Federal loans to private enterprises. The P.W.A. is significant in American history for the element of economic planning (*see* Planned Economy) introduced into a laissez-faire³¹ order as well as for whatever recovery benefits were derived.

[S. C. Wallace, *The New Deal in Action*.]

HARVEY WISH

Publicity Acts (1903 and 1909). In order to restrict the evils of stock inflation and overcapitalization, and the sale of bogus securities, Congress passed the Publicity Acts of 1903 and 1909, often referred to as the Federal Blue Sky laws. These acts, the initial ones in the regulation and control of securities, have been reinforced by similar measures in the states, and more recently by the Federal Securities and Securities Exchange Acts³² of 1933. The Act of 1903 created a Bureau of Corporations with power "to investigate into the organization, conduct, and management of the business of any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce among the several states and with foreign nations," common carriers exempted. The Act of 1909 made illegal and subject to punishment the making of a contract for the sale or purchase of securities on credit or margin without the actual sale or purchase being made; of a contract for the sale or purchase of securities on credit or margin, when they reach a certain market price, without an actual bona fide sale or purchase taking place; of a contract providing for paying the difference between contract and market price, the securities not having been actually delivered or received.

[Rinehard J. Swenson, *The National Government and Business*; James T. Young, *The New American Government and Its Work*.]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Publicity Laws. Following many efforts to promote the purity of elections by specific legislative measures, the first comprehensive Corrupt Practices Act on this side of the Atlantic, itself modeled somewhat on the British law of 1883

was passed by New York in 1890. Today forty-five states have such acts, applying either to primary or final elections or to both. One of the principal purposes sought by legislation of this character is the publicity of campaign contributions and expenditures (*see* Campaign Resources and Uses). The earlier corrupt practices acts required publicity only at a certain date following the election—a capital illustration of the proverb about locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen. At present in seventeen states reports must be filed before as well as after the election. For example, the New Jersey law of 1918 required a periodic accounting from candidates during a period of eight months, which must be brought down to date on the Friday or Saturday next preceding the election, and completed within twenty days thereafter. Minnesota and Utah also provide for statements each month during the campaign. Federal publicity laws date from 1910, the most comprehensive being the Act of 1925. According to the latter, treasurers of campaign committees must file statements in January, March, June and September, also immediately before elections. Final reports of candidates for the Senate and House must be made within thirty days after election.

[Louise Overacker, *Money in Elections*.]

ROBERT C. BROOKS

Public Occurrences Both Foreign and Domestick (Sept. 25, 1690), earliest colonial approach to the newspaper, was promptly suppressed in Boston, where it made its first and only appearance. Its vigorous publisher, Benjamin Harris, exiled London and Boston bookseller and printer of the *New-England Primer*^o, gave sufficient offense in not obtaining official leave for publication, but “the passage referring to the French King and to the Maquas [Mohawk Indians]” also caused the governor and council “much distaste.” Arranged in double columns on three handbill-size pages, it reported in surprisingly anticipatory news manner the Thanksgiving plans of “Plimouth” Indians, disappearance of two children, decline in smallpox, a Boston fire, a suicide and other matters. Harris planned to issue it “once a moneth (or if any Glut of Occurrences happen, oftener,) . . .” but after the authorities declared their “high resentment and Disallowance,” there is no record of a similar publication until the appearance of the *Boston News-Letter*^o in 1704. The only known copy was found in 1845 in the London Public Record Office, where it is preserved.

[James Melvin Lee, *History of American Journalism*; Willard G. Bleyer, *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism*.]

IRVING DILLIARD

Pueblo. The village Indians of New Mexico and Arizona developed a unique type of architecture culminating about 1000 A.D. in large apartmenthouse-like structures of several hundred rooms.

In the modern pueblos, as Hopi, Zuñi, Acoma^o, Laguna, Taos, etc., are the surviving forms of this architecture. The type ground plan is 200 to 300 rectangular rooms, averaging about ten by twelve feet, grouped around two courts in the form of the letter “E.” The second, and each succeeding story, was of less width than the preceding, thus forming successive terraces, facing the courts. All rooms in the lower story were entered through the roof. The walls were of stone and adobe, the whole easy to defend. In pre-Columbian time such a building stood alone and housed about 1000 people. The agricultural lands were on favored spots within a radius of two to five miles.

[P. E. Goddard, *The Southwest Indians*; E. L. Hewett, *Ancient Life in the American Southwest*.]

CLARK WISSLER

Pueblo Indians, THE, are a sedentary people, living from time immemorial in towns (*pueblos*, in Spanish) as hunters and farmers. Their habitat, today confined to New Mexico and Arizona, once embraced wide stretches of present Utah, Colorado and Nevada. Their lands were visited for the first time by Coronado^o and his army in 1540. Permanent settlement of Spaniards among them began in 1598. Practically all became Christians, the Franciscans^o achieving their conversion and thereafter serving their spiritual needs. Their rebellion against Spanish rule in August, 1680 (*see* Pueblo Revolt), cost the lives of some 300 Spanish settlers and twenty-one Franciscan missionaries.

[F. W. Hodge, *Handbook of American Indians*; E. R. Forrest, *Missions and Pueblos of the Old Southwest*.]

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK

Pueblo Revolt, THE (1680–96), was led by Popé, a Tewa medicine man who had suffered cruelties under the Spaniards. There were over 3000 Spanish settlers in New Mexico^o by 1680 and he desired to drive them out. Several hundred settlers were massacred, and the rest escaped to the El Paso region. The Indians ravaged the country and held sway under Popé, whom they soon disliked as their economic conditions grew worse. In 1692 Gov. Pedro de Vargas led an expedition to recover New Mexico. After some stiff resistance, the Pueblos were reconquered, and Taos^o, the center of the conspiracy, burned.

[H. E. Bolton, *Spanish Borderlands*.]

LILLIAN ESTELLE FISHER

Puerto Rico was one of the less important Spanish colonies. The aboriginal Indians soon died out, and there was little white immigration until the latter part of the 18th century. Thereafter the island gradually became more prosperous, with coffee, sugar and tobacco the chief crops. Despite the autocratic character of the Spanish government, there were no serious political disturbances.

The island was ceded to the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War⁷⁰. In the government established by the Foraker Act⁷¹ of 1900, the President of the United States appointed a governor and an executive council, consisting of the six heads of administrative departments plus five Puerto Ricans. This council was the upper house of the legislature, the lower being elected by the people. The inhabitants were not given American citizenship. In the "insular cases,"⁷² the United States Supreme Court upheld the right of Congress to treat newly acquired territories as not fully incorporated into the United States and hence not subject to all of the provisions of the Constitution.

Puerto Rican dissatisfaction with the regime thus established led to the passage of a new organic law, the Jones Act, approved March 2, 1917. This granted full American citizenship to the natives of the island, together with a larger measure of local self-government. The President of the United States continued to appoint the governor, the attorney general, the commissioner of education and the auditor, but the heads of the other executive departments were to be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Puerto Rican senate, the upper house of the insular legislature which was to be elected by popular vote.

The Jones Act has not satisfied the aspirations of Puerto Rico's political leaders. One group has advocated eventual independence, another admission to the Union as a state. More recently a radical Nationalist party has resorted to violence and even murder in its campaign for immediate independence.

A chief cause of political discontent has been the bad economic situation, and especially overpopulation and excessive dependence upon sugar and a few other crops. In 1935 the Federal Government inaugurated a program of economic rehabilitation administered by the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.

[Brookings Institution, *Porto Rico and Its Problems*; B. W. and J. W. Diffie, *Porto Rico, A Broken Pledge*.]

DANA G. MUNRO

Puget Sound. Long before Puget Sound was actually discovered and explored 18th-century

maps pictured an inland sea in that region because geographers had given credence to fictitious accounts of voyages to such a sea. The English expedition under Capt. George Vancouver⁷³ was the first to explore Puget Sound (1792) although other vessels had seen and entered the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which leads to this inland sea. Among those who had seen the Strait before Vancouver were the English sea captains, Barkley and Mears, the American Capt. Gray, and the Spanish captains Quimper and Elisa.

Vancouver's men completely circumnavigated the Sound in the ship's boats during the early summer of 1792. Many of the chief geographical features were given the names still used. The Sound itself was named for one of his officers, Lt. Peter Puget.

Lt. Charles Wilkes⁷⁴ of the United States Navy surveyed the Sound in 1841 and strongly urged the United States Government to acquire it, which he described as the best harbor north of San Francisco. Pioneer settlement began in 1841.

[Edmund S. Meany, *History of the State of Washington*.]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Pujo Committee. In February, 1912, the House of Representatives by resolution directed its Committee on Banking and Currency to ascertain whether there existed in the United States a concentration of financial and banking power, "a money trust" (see Money Power). A subcommittee, headed by Rep. Arsène Pujo of Louisiana, with Samuel Untermyer of New York as counsel, conducted hearings, at which J. P. Morgan, George F. Baker and other financiers testified. After examining a great mass of evidence, the majority report declared that existing banking and credit practices resulted in a "vast and growing concentration of control of money and credit in the hands of a comparatively few men."

[Money Trust Investigation Hearings, 1912-13; L. D. Brandeis, *Other People's Money*.]

THOMAS S. BARCLAY

Pulaski, Fort (Ga.), located in Cockspur Island and commanding both channels of the Savannah River, was commenced in 1829. Georgia state troops seized it when the Civil War began, but on April 11, 1862, after a fifteen-hour bombardment by Union forces under command of Capt. Q. A. Gilmore, it was captured and thenceforward held by Union forces, cutting off Savannah⁷⁵ from outside communication, except by blockade runners⁷⁶.

[C. B. Boynton, *History of the Navy during the Rebellion; Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. II.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Pullman Strike. As a result of the Panic of 1893⁷, various railroad companies suffered heavy losses which led them to curtail their operations and to reduce the wages of their employees. Because of depression conditions, the Pullman Palace Car Company likewise reduced the wages of its employees an average of 25%. This company, organized in 1867, carried on its chief operations at Pullman, a town which it owned just south of Chicago. When wages were reduced no reduction was made in the rentals and fees charged employees in this town. About 4000 disgruntled employees joined Eugene V. Debs' American Railway Union in the spring of 1894. On May 11, 1894, about 2500 employees quit work and forced the closing of the shops. Thereafter attempts were made to arbitrate the differences between the company and its employees but the former took the view that there was nothing to arbitrate. Nor would the company consent to bargain with the union, though its officials expressed readiness to deal with employees individually.

The local strike soon developed into a general railroad strike when members of the American Railway Union⁸ refused to handle Pullman cars. First, twenty-four railroads centering in Chicago, whose affairs were handled by the General Managers' Association, were tied up. This led to a general railroad tie-up throughout the whole West by June 28. Two days later the strike had spread to practically all parts of the country. A result was serious delay in the transportation of mail. At this juncture Federal Judges C. D. Woods and P. S. Grosscup issued a "blanket injunction" prohibiting all interference with trains. The injunction was defied and violence was resorted to by the strikers. Thereupon President Cleveland ordered Federal troops into Chicago on July 4. Following their arrival there was much mob violence and destruction of railroad property. Rioting occurred in other cities as far west as Oakland, Calif., so that, on July 5, Federal troops were ordered to strike duty in that state. By July 13, some trains were running under military guard and a few days later the strike was broken. By July 20 all Federal troops were out of Chicago. A feature of the strike was the arrest of Debs⁹, and his subsequent conviction for violation of the injunction. This led to a long-drawn-out campaign to curb the use of "blanket injunctions" in labor disputes.

[W. H. Carwardine, *The Pullman Strike*; U. S. Strike Commission, *Report on the Chicago Strike of June-July, 1894*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Pullmans. In 1836-37 the Cumberland Valley Railroad of Pennsylvania installed sleeping-car service between Harrisburg and Chambersburg by adapting the ordinary day coach to sleeping requirements. Each car was divided into four compartments of three bunks each, built on one side of the car with one rear section for washing facilities. Passengers were given no bed-clothes, could read only by candlelight, and were warmed by box stoves. The seats on most cars were foul with boot scrapings, the floors receptacles of filth, and personal arrangements were usually crowded. Travel under such circumstances could be justified only as a painful duty. A New York cabinetmaker, George M. Pullman, arrived in Chicago during 1855 to apply his inventive ability to altering these conditions. At Bloomington, Ill., in 1858, Pullman remodeled two Chicago and Alton coaches into sleeping-cars each of which contained ten sleeping sections, two washrooms and a linen locker. Although this venture proved unprofitable, Pullman decided in 1864 to create a more elaborate car, which was equipped at a cost of \$20,178.14, a huge amount for car construction in that day. "The Pioneer" contained a folding upper berth, sliding seats, artistically decorated furnishings, special car springs, better lighting, heating and ventilation, and was enlarged in height and width. In 1867 came the incorporation of the Pullman's Palace Car Company with a capitalization of \$1,000,000. That year the new luxurious model, the "President," included a kitchen, the predecessor of the dining car. In 1870 the Pullman car completed its first transcontinental journey. The Pullman Company introduced to America the brilliant Pintsch gas light as an illuminant in 1883 and was a pioneer in the introduction of electric lighting. Other improvements followed, and competitors were outdistanced. Pullman service, by introducing comfort to transportation, revolutionized travel both in the United States and abroad.

[Joseph Husband, *The Story of the Pullman Car*.]

HARVEY WISH

Pulp. See Paper and Pulp.

Pulteney Purchase, THE (1791), the residue of the Phelps-Gorham Purchase¹⁰, comprised over 1,000,000 acres in Steuben, Ontario and Yates counties and parts of Monroe, Wayne, Allegany, Livingston and Genesee counties, all in western New York. These "Genesee lands" were purchased for £75,000 from William Franklin, Robert Morris' London agent, by an association styled "The Pulteney Associates." Charles Williamson, the first American agent, laid out Bath,

N. Y., in 1792. The last transaction of the "Associates" was recorded in December, 1926.

[A. M. Sakolski, *The Great American Land Bubble*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Pump-Priming. In the old-fashioned pump is a small leather suction valve which, when it becomes dry, must be moistened or primed by pouring in enough water to cause it to swell so that it will function properly. Applied to the economic situation, pump-priming means spending by the Government in an attempt to stimulate private spending and the expansion of business and industry.

Pump-priming, in this sense, was really begun in 1932 under President Hoover when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation⁹⁷ was created to make loans to banks, railroads and other industries. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who began his administration with an economy program, became convinced by the fall of 1933 that pump-priming was necessary to achieve economic recovery. Thereafter, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the work-relief agencies, the Public Works Administration⁹⁸ and other organizations, billions of dollars were used for priming the pump. These expenditures averaged a quarter of a billion dollars a month in 1934 and 1935, about a third of a billion a month in 1936, but only about fifty million a month at the end of 1937. The recession of that year caused the New Dealers⁹⁹ to again resort to extensive pump-priming in 1938 with an authorized expenditure of approximately \$5,000,000,000.

[Another Trial for "Pump-Priming," *The Congressional Digest*, Vol. 17, Nos. 6-7, June-July, 1938, pp. 165-192.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Punishment, Cruel and Unusual. The Eighth Amendment to the Constitution¹⁰⁰ of the United States declares that "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted." This is a reproduction of the tenth guarantee contained in the English Bill of Rights of 1689 with the exception that the words "ought not to be required" appear in the latter instead of the more positive words "shall not be required," which are to be found in the American Bill of Rights. Considered as a fundamental guarantee of liberty, the provision forbidding "cruel and unusual punishments" was included in a number of the original state constitutions of the Revolutionary period, notably those of Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina and Massachusetts. Naturally, when a national Bill of Rights was adopt-

ed in 1791 the guarantee was included to prevent excesses by the Government such as had been common in 17th-century England.

[E. M. Eriksson and D. N. Rowe, *American Constitutional History*; C. Ellis Stevens, *Sources of the Constitution of the United States*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Punishments, Colonial. The New England and Quaker colonies of Pennsylvania and West Jersey had in general a more humane set of criminal punishments than prevailed in New York and the South. In the former, larceny was punished by multiple restitution and whipping. In the South the death penalty was at times enforced in accord with English law whereby larceny from the person in an amount above twelve pence was a nonclergyable felony. In the majority of instances, however, multiple restitution was also exacted in the South for this offense, as in Maryland under the act of 1715.

In Massachusetts barbarous or inhumane tortures were forbidden almost from the beginning. However, the Puritan code leaned in the direction of exemplary and humiliating punishments, such as the ducking-stool for the scold, the stocks for the vagrant, the letter sewn on the garment for the adulterer, branding for the burglar, or riding a wooden horse with an empty pitcher in one hand to indicate a propensity to strong drink. Hanging was the normal method of capital punishment, and it was by this method, not by burning, that the New England witches¹⁰¹ were executed. In West Jersey only treason and murder were capital offenses and in Pennsylvania murder alone was punishable by death. Imprisonment at hard labor was prescribed in most cases for noncapital crimes, but by 1700 the Quakers had abandoned their early humane theories with regard to punishment.

In New York and the South two tendencies stand out conspicuously—the extreme severity in penalties prescribed and the almost exclusive employment of fines or some form of corporal punishment as the prevailing modes of executing the penalty imposed. Whipping, branding, mutilating, confinement in the stocks or pillory, and ducking were among the most popular of these forms of punishments, and in Delaware the whipping post is still in use. At times whippings were carried to excess. The New Englanders observed the Mosaic law setting thirty-nine stripes as the maximum penalty. In addition to hanging, burning and quartering were also employed in New York and the South. The large number of Negroes convicted in the Negro Plot of 1741¹⁰² were burnt at the stake. Others were transported, a method used in New England also for

dealing with captive Indians in wartime. Treason was punished by disposing of the body of the executed person variously, the head to be set up one place, and the quarters set up in other communities. For the murder of an overseer, a Maryland Negro in 1745 was sentenced to have his right hand cut off, to be hanged and then quartered. Except in New England, for treason and felony all the offender's goods and chattels were forfeited to the king and the attainder^o also brought with it an incapacity to inherit or transmit property to one's heirs.

Both in New England and in the South mutilation was not uncommon. In the South for contempt of court, an ear might be cut off or a tongue pierced with a hot iron. In Virginia an ear might be nailed to the pillory and then cut off as a punishment for runaway slaves. For slander in Virginia the tongue might be bored through with an awl and the convicted party forced to pass through a guard of forty men and be "butted" by each, and then be kicked down or "footed" out of the fort, or trailed behind a boat. For criticizing the authorities in Virginia one might be pilloried with a placard, lose both ears, serve the colony a year, or be unable to become a freeman, or worse, have his ears nailed to the pillory or be laid "neck and heels" in irons and fined. Castration might be ordered by the court of any slave convicted of attempting to rape a white woman.

[H. E. Barnes, *History of the Penal, Reformatory, and Correctional Institutions of New Jersey*; A. P. Scott, *Criminal Law in Colonial Virginia*; R. B. Morris, Massachusetts and the Common Law, in *American Historical Review*, 1926; H. W. K. Fitzroy, *The Punishment of Crime in Provincial Pennsylvania*, in *Penn. Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, July, 1936.]

RICHARD B. MORRIS

Purchas' Pilgrims. See *Hakluyt's Voyages*.

Purchasing Power. See Money, Purchasing Power of.

Pure Food and Drug Acts. The demand for a national Pure Food and Drug Act became insistent after the "embalmed beef"^o scandal of the Spanish-American War. Some states had already passed laws to protect against adulteration^o, but measures were limited in scope and application. Upton Sinclair's *Jungle* and the articles of Harvey W. Wiley attracted the attention of President Theodore Roosevelt, who began the reform by securing the passage of the Meat Inspection Act of 1906^o. He also sponsored the Pure Food and Drug Act passed in 1906, to become effective Jan. 1, 1907. The act, applying to goods shipped in foreign or interstate commerce,

was designed to prevent the adulteration or misbranding of foods or drugs. Confectionery was declared to be adulterated if it contained poisonous color, flavor or other ingredients detrimental to health. Food was held to be adulterated if it was composed of filthy or decomposed animal matter, if it contained poisonous or deleterious ingredients, or if anything had been added to conceal inferior goods. Proprietary medicines must be labeled so as to indicate the percentage of narcotics, stimulants or other ingredients that might be harmful. Misleading statements as to the composition or purity of package foods or drugs rendered the offending distributor or manufacturer subject to Federal prosecution, provided that a distributor was not liable where he could show an adequate guarantee from the vendor.

The original act proved inadequate in several particulars and amendments were added in 1912, 1913 and 1923. The first amendment provided a penalty against false statements as to the curative quality of drugs, and the supplementary law of 1913 provided for the stamping or marking of the weight of packaged goods. The 1923 law defined "filled" milk and prohibited its shipment interstate.

In 1933 a demand arose for more stringent control of the advertised commodities subject to regulation under the Pure Food and Drug Act. Congress, in response to this demand, passed the Wheeler-Lea Act which became effective May 21, 1938. This act extended the scope of the original act by providing for the prosecution of individuals or agencies who engage in the presentation of false or misleading statements concerning "foods, drugs, diagnostic and therapeutic devices, and cosmetics," provided that such advertising is disseminated outside the boundary of any individual state. Radio stations, newspapers and magazines are not held liable if they disclose the name of the distributor or manufacturer responsible for the false advertising. The sections of the act dealing with advertising are enforceable by the Federal Trade Commission^o, and the question of misbranding is left to the Food and Drug Administration.

[The Code of Laws of the United States.]

THEODORE G. GRONERT

Puritans and Puritanism. These terms originated in England in the 1560's, when they were used to describe the men who wished to reform the Church of England beyond the limits established by Elizabeth and who strove to "purify" it of what they considered the remnants of Popery. Puritanism was first formulated as an

ecclesiastical protest and was at the beginning devoted to attacking clerical vestments, the use of mediæval ceremonial, and the structure of the official hierarchy; it wished to substitute a church government modeled upon the example of the Apostles in the New Testament. However, this preoccupation with polity and ritual is to be interpreted as an expression rather than the substance of Puritanism. Puritans were men of intense piety, who took literally and seriously the doctrines of original sin and salvation by faith; they believed that true Christians should obey the will of God as expressed in divine revelation, and they condemned the Church of England because they found its order impious and anti-Christian. After 1603 their opposition to the Church became allied with the parliamentary opposition to the royal prerogative, and in the 1640's Puritans and Parliamentarians united in open warfare against Charles I.

Puritanism was thus a movement of religious protest, inspired by a driving zeal and an exalted religious devotion, which its enemies called fanaticism, but which to Puritans was an issue of life or death. At the same time, it is to be connected with the social revolution of the 17th century and the struggle of a rising capitalist middle class against the absolutist state. It was a religious and social radicalism that in England proved incapable of maintaining unity within its own ranks and during the 1650's split into myriad sects and opinions. The process of division began in the 16th century when "Separatists"⁷⁰ broke off from the main body of Puritans; a small congregation of these extremists fled to Plymouth⁷¹ in 1620, though the major contribution of Puritanism to American life was the settlement of the Massachusetts Bay Company⁷² at Salem and Boston in 1629-30. This band of Puritans was inspired to migrate by a conviction that the cause had become hopeless in England after the dissolution of the Parliament of 1629. Within the next decade some 20,000 persons came to Massachusetts and Connecticut and there erected a society and a church in strict accordance with Puritan ideals. Ruled by vigorous leaders, these colonies were able to check centrifugal tendencies, to perpetuate and to institutionalize Puritanism in America long after the English movement had sunk into confusion and a multiplicity of sects. Yet in so far as Puritanism was but the English variant of Calvinism, and was theologically at one with all Reformed churches, New England Puritanism must be viewed as merely one of the forms in which the Calvinist version of Protestantism has been carried to America, and its influence must be considered

along with that of Scotch-Irish, Dutch, or French Protestantism. In the American setting the word Puritanism has become practically synonymous with New England simply because New England (except for Rhode Island) achieved a social organization and an intellectual articulation that trenchantly crystallized the Puritan spirit. Puritanism can be said to have affected American life wherever Calvinism has affected it, but most markedly at those points where America has been at all determined by persons of New England origin.

[R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*; M. M. Knappen, *Tudor Puritanism*; William Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism*; J. T. Adams, *The Founding of New England*; Perry Miller and T. H. Johnson, *The Puritans*.]

PERRY MILLER

Purple Heart, Order of the, was established by Gen. George Washington at Newburgh, N. Y., on Aug. 7, 1782, as a reward for meritorious action and extraordinary fidelity. It was revived on Feb. 22, 1932, by General Order No. 3 of the War Department. The decoration is a heart-shaped medal with a gold border and a center of purple enamel. On it is a bust of Washington and the inscription "For Military Merit." In 1932 the award was confined to recipients of the Meritorious Services Citation Certificate or soldiers wounded in action. It is now granted for meritorious acts or services performed in time of war.

ROSCOE R. HILL

Put-in-Bay Naval Battle. See Erie, Lake, Battle of.

Quacks. Physicians were few in pioneer America, and amateur doctoring often expanded into quackery. Many "doctors" were former cobblers, actors and what not. A French traveler visiting here in 1799 met an ex-actor who drew teeth, did bleeding, and sold "remedies" and ballads. Many nostrums arose, often vicious, and were vended by local or itinerant doctors or pack peddlers. As early as 1711 a Philadelphia woman was making "Tuscarora Rice," a sure cure for tuberculosis, from corn. Roots, herbs, mysterious pills and charms were widely commingled in the quack's prescriptions. Later, electric batteries, metal rods passed over the body, mesmerism and other devices were practised upon the ailing. Nor were the fakers all medical. The *Farmer's Almanack* prayed in 1813, "From quack doctors, quack preachers, quack lawyers, mad dogs and yellow fever, good Lord, deliver us!" In the 19th century the quacks multiplied enormously. Phrenology, physiognomy, astrology, spiritualism, "animal magnetism," "electro-biology" and every

imaginable hocus-pocus, all were called into service by sharpers for the duping of the credulous. Country attorneys practised with little or no knowledge of the law. Quack exhorters staged evangelistic meetings for a price. Patent medicines, including "cures" for tuberculosis and cancer and many which cured everything, created a number of millionaires. Diplomas in medicine and dentistry were sold by bogus "colleges." There were electric belts, electric anklets, healing pads to be worn over the liver and scores of other devices. Quacks operated large sanitariums and "medical dispensaries" where thousands of patients resorted annually. As early as 1800, legitimate physicians formed associations in the larger cities to fight charlatanry, but with political bribery opposing them, found it a difficult task. For some time after 1900, "cancer cures" flourished in many large cities, and even after they had been curbed, many less flagrant deceptions continued.

[Francis R. Packard, *History of Medicine in the United States*; Richardson Wright, *Hawkers and Walkers in Early America*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Quaker Experiment in Politics, Pennsylvania, THE (1682-1756). The distinctive feature of this, William Penn's "Holy Experiment,"⁷⁷ was its attempt to maintain the principle of pacifism in the management of a political state. The military was to be eliminated and the civil police reduced to a minimum. In actual practice, however, Penn's ideal was greatly modified. He appointed non-Quaker governors who could be "stiff with neighbors upon occasion." And the "coarser functions of government" were frequently resorted to, due in part to the military demands of the Indian frontier.

The severest test of the experiment, however, was its internal politics. Quaker politicians, like others, pursued their ideals of justice and liberty relentlessly. To achieve their ends they engaged in a struggle for power, using nonpacific methods which struck at the roots of the "holy experiment." Their spiritual fiber thus weakened, they evaded the military issue whenever possible instead of facing it in the pacifist way. By 1710 they were hardened to voting money for the "king's use" when asked by the crown for military appropriations. And by 1756 the Quaker assembly renounced all scruples against military measures, while delaying appropriations indefinitely during bitter struggles with the governor over methods for raising the money.

The substantial Quaker leadership deplored these practices. Some came to regard political activity as incompatible with the Quaker ethic.

When war was declared against the Indians in April, 1756, making the French and Indian War⁷⁸ a stern reality, the more conscientious Quakers in the legislature resigned. More resignations followed when Parliament threatened a bill to bar Quakers from office altogether. Quakers were now a minority in the assembly, and the "holy experiment" was ended. This reaction against political activity reached its climax in 1758 when the Yearly Meeting forbade all office-holding involving responsibility for political action.

[Isaac Sharpless, *A Quaker Experiment in Government*, Philadelphia, 1898; Guy F. Hershberger, *The Pennsylvania Quaker Experiment in Politics, 1682-1756*, in *Memnonite Quarterly Review*, 10:187-221]

GUY FRANKLIN HERSHBERGER

Quaker Hill, Battle at. See Rhode Island, Sullivan in (1778).

Quaker Indian Policy. Relations between colonial Quakers and the Indians were singularly friendly, largely because the Quakers practised with unusual consistency the common principles of justice and fair-dealing. Notably in Pennsylvania, where for a long period Friends controlled the government, their purchases of Indian land titles, symbolized in the popular mind by Penn's treaty under the elm at Shackamaxon⁷⁹, were negotiated with scrupulous regard for Indian rights, without resort to force. Later, when the Indians had been cheated by Penn's non-Quaker sons, as in the notorious "Walking Purchase" of 1737⁸⁰, and had been provoked to violence by Scotch-Irish⁸¹ frontiersmen and French intriguers, Quakers resigned from the provincial government (1756) rather than participate in the ensuing French and Indian War⁸². Privately they tried to placate the Indians by gifts and friendly counsel during treaty negotiations.

In 1795 Quakers organized missionary work among the Indians in western New York, a departure from their former practice of voluntary preaching by concerned individuals. This work gradually extended westward and suddenly expanded in 1869, when President Grant inaugurated a "Peace Policy," and attempted to halt the recurring Indian wars by placing Quakers in charge of the agencies in Kansas, Indian Territory and Nebraska. Difficulties with the Hayes administration obliged Friends to resign from corporate responsibility, but they have continued to maintain missions and to participate in philanthropic groups such as the Indian Rights Association. (See also Indian Policy.)

[R. W. Kelsey, *Friends and the Indians*.]

THOMAS E. DRAKE

Quakers. THE American Quakerism was brought from England by the followers of George Fox, founder of the Society of Friends, who began to preach in 1647. Ann Austin and Mary Fisher arrived in Boston in 1656, where the Puritans deported them and prohibited further Quaker immigration. Zealous missionaries continued to invade the Bay Colony, however, and were fined, flogged and banished. Three men and one woman who defied banishment were hanged on Boston Common^m (1659-61), martyrs to the cause of religious freedom. In tolerant Rhode Island, leading families, embracing the new faith, established a "Yearly Meeting" at Newport (1661). In New Netherland persecution was followed by toleration, and Friends were allowed to settle on Long Island. They appeared in Maryland (1656) and in Virginia (1657). When Fox himself visited America in 1672 there were Quakers scattered from South Carolina to the New England coast.

Meanwhile plans were laid for a considerable emigration of British Quakers to the New World to escape persecution at home. Settlements at Salem, N. J. (1675), and Burlington (1677) preceded the "Holy Experiment"^m which William Penn, distinguished convert to Quakerism, undertook in 1681. Penn's colony became a haven for thousands of Quakers from the British Isles, as well as for Rhineland German sectarians. Uniting with their brethren in New Jersey and Delaware, Pennsylvania Quakers organized a Yearly Meeting which became the most influential in America. Other Yearly Meetings, independent but in close touch with Pennsylvania Friends, appeared in New England, New York, Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina. Each contained its subordinate Quarterly Meetings, made up of local Monthly Meetings, basic congregational units in the Society. Democracy in church government and equality of opportunity for religious expression evolved from the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light of God which illumines the heart of every man. Friends met to wait silently upon the Lord, with occasional sermons or prayers by those who felt moved to speak. They renounced ritual and the sacraments, banned music and art, but the very simplicity of their meetinghouses made for dignity and charm, and the uprightness of Quaker lives lent grace to their plainness of speech and apparel.

Active proselytism in the 17th century gave way to quietism in the 18th. Persecution thereupon ceased, except when Quakers refused to give military service or pay church tithes. They perfected a rigid discipline, and punished

breaches, such as marrying out of the group, by expulsion. Friends became a "peculiar people." The westward movement^m after the Revolution drew them over the mountains, usually to the slave-free soil of the Northwest Territory^m. Gradually they spread to the Pacific coast, establishing Yearly Meetings in Ohio (1813), Indiana (1821), Iowa (1863), Kansas (1872), Illinois (1887), Oregon (1893), California (1895) and Nebraska (1908). Another stream of migration led into western New York and across Lake Ontario into Canada.

The evangelical movement in American Protestantism in the first half of the 19th century brought schism to the Society of Friends. A "Great Separation" in 1827-28 produced the Orthodox and Hicksite^m groups, one evangelical, the other unitarian in tendency. The Hicksites avoided further schism, and their Yearly Meetings united in a biennial "General Conference" in 1902. Opposition to the evangelical trends in the Orthodox body resulted in a small separation of Wilburite or Conservative Friends in New England in 1845, and later in New York and some of the western Yearly Meetings. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting forestalled a separation by ceasing to correspond with the other Orthodox bodies in 1857, and refusing to join in their Five Years Meetings, which began in 1887. Evangelical tendencies increased in the Five Years group, with revivals^m, hymn-singing and salaried pastors as common to "Friends' Churches" as to their Baptist and Methodist neighbors. They abandoned their peculiarities of speech and dress in all but the Conservative groups, and by the early years of the 20th century Quakers had largely ceased outwardly to be a "peculiar people."

In their social testimonies, the doctrine of the Inner Light found frequent expression in humanitarian activity. As Quakers had attacked the slave trade and slavery^m in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and made notable contributions in the fields of Indian relations, prison reform, education, temperance and care of the insane^m, their descendants sought to apply Quaker principles to the 20th-century problems of war and social maladjustment. The American Friends Service Committee, organized during the World War to enable Friends to engage in noncombatant war work, united all the Quaker groups in effecting their peace testimony. After the war the Service Committee continued as a relief and good-will agency abroad and at home. Theological differences among American Friends became less important as a result of this co-operation and in 1937 they joined Quakers every

where in a World Conference at Swarthmore and Haverford colleges, near Philadelphia. Out of this grew a Friends World Committee for Consultation. It was estimated in 1935 that there were approximately 111,139 Quakers in the United States and Canada. Rural meetings and membership were declining slightly. But the appearance in urban and university centers of Quaker meetings unattached to the old schismatic groups indicated a growing interest in basic Quaker principles and their application to religious worship and the problems of modern life.

[A. C. Thomas, *A History of the Friends in America*.]
THOMAS E. DRAKE

Quantrill's Raid (Aug. 21, 1863). William Clarke Quantrill, at the head of a band of 448 Missouri guerrillas or "bushwhackers,"^{qq} fell upon Lawrence, Kans., in the early dawn. The town was taken completely by surprise and was undefended; the local militia company was unable to assemble, and the few Federal soldiers were stationed across the river. The raiders first stormed the Eldridge Hotel. After it had been surrendered, and set on fire, the raiders scattered over the town, killing, burning and plundering indiscriminately, though they did respect women and small children. Generally, the more prominent men, knowing what to expect, managed to escape. All the business buildings and more than half of the dwellings were totally or partially destroyed. The known dead numbered 142. Withdrawing at the approach of Federal troops, the guerrillas, although pursued, were able to reach Missouri with few losses. Unlike other border raids of the Civil War, this was not a mere harrying foray, but was a general massacre. It was no doubt prompted by the old bitterness against Lawrence for its part in the Kansas conflict (*see* Border War), but the excuse given was reprisal for Lane's raid on Osceola, Mo. Quantrill, who had lived in Lawrence under the name of Charlie Hart and had been driven out as an undesirable, was probably motivated by a personal grudge.

[L. W. Spring, *Kansas, the Prelude to the War for the Union*; Richard Cordley, *History of Lawrence, Kansas*; W. E. Connelley, *Quantrill and the Border Wars*.]

SAMUEL A. JOHNSON

Quarantine, formerly conducted by the states and cities, is now administered by the United States Public Health^{ss} Service. The work falls into two major activities—the inspection of vessels and crews and the medical examination of arriving aliens, including immigrants and non-immigrants (*see* Ellis Island). Immigrants with certain diseases are mandatorily excluded. Examination of prospective immigrants at American

consulates in foreign countries, instituted in 1924, has greatly diminished the distress incident to rejection after arrival at United States ports.

[*Annual Reports of the Surgeon General, U. S. Public Health Service*.]

THOMAS PARRAN

Quartering. *See* Billeting.

Quartering Act, THE (one of the Coercion Acts^{ss}), was passed by Parliament in June, 1774, to permit effective action by the British troops sent to Boston after the Tea Party^{ss}. In 1768 the Boston Whigs, taking advantage of the absence of barracks in Boston, attempted to quarter the troops in Castle William rather than in the town itself where they were urgently needed. To forestall a like effort, the Quartering Act of 1774 provided that when there were no barracks where troops were required, the authorities must provide quarters for them on the spot; if they failed to do so, the governor might compel the use of inns or uninhabited buildings. The Boston patriots, however, forced the British troops to remain camped on the Boston Common^{ss} until November, 1774, by refusing to allow workmen to repair the distilleries and empty buildings Gen. Gage had procured for quarters. (*See also* Billeting.)

[Edward Channing, *History of the United States*, Vol. III.]

JOHN C. MILLER

Quasi-Judicial Agencies. Since the latter part of the 19th century there has been a growing tendency on the part of both Congress and the state legislatures to delegate broad legislative, judicial and executive powers to administrative agencies. Under the American constitutional system, a direct delegation^{ss} of either legislative or judicial power is prohibited because it is a violation of the fundamental principle of separation of powers^{ss}. In order to avoid this constitutional difficulty, the courts have been inclined to take the position that there has been no direct delegation of power. The administrative agency, it is contended, merely "seems to be" exercising legislative or judicial power. In other words, it is quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial.

The rapid growth of quasi-judicial agencies in recent years has been a perhaps inevitable result of the expansion of governmental regulation^{ss} which in turn has been caused by the increasingly complex economic and social development which has characterized the machine age. More and more the Federal and state governments have departed from the doctrine of *laissez faire*^{ss} and, in contrast, have tended to apply their police powers^{ss} through administrative agencies so

as to limit individual action. In order that speedy action and flexibility might be secured, the legislative bodies have been inclined merely to set up general goals or standards, leaving it to the judgment of designated administrative agents to determine how the will of the legislature can best be attained. As a result, the agency is able to develop extremely broad powers. It becomes, for all intents and purposes, the real lawmaker, as well as the prosecutor and the court. Were it not for the fact that persons affected by its decisions may appeal to a regular court, a quasi-judicial agency might easily become arbitrary and tyrannical.

The Interstate Commerce Commission⁷⁰ created by Congress in 1887 and the industrial accident commissions created by various state legislatures are typical examples of quasi-judicial agencies created for special purposes. Quasi-judicial powers have also frequently been assigned to regular administrative officials. Thus, in 1921, the Secretary of Agriculture was selected to enforce the Packers and Stockyards Act⁷¹. Out of his exercise of quasi-judicial powers an important case arose which was decided by the Supreme Court on April 25, 1938. In this case, known as *Fred O. Morgan, et al. v. United States*, the Court held invalid an order by the Secretary fixing the maximum rates to be charged by marketing agencies at the Kansas City Stockyards. Chief Justice Charles E. Hughes held that the marketing agencies had not received a "full and fair hearing" and that they had not been given a "reasonable opportunity to know the claims advanced against them." This decision, at least temporarily, had the effect of halting the growing trend on the part of quasi-judicial agencies to disregard in their hearings what the Chief Justice called "the cherished judicial tradition embodying the basic concepts of fair play."

[James M. Landis, *The Administrative Process*; John M. Pfiffner, *Public Administration*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Quebec, Attack by Phips on (1690). In retaliation for French depredations, the New England colonies and New York formed an expedition to capture Canada for England (see King William's War). On Aug. 9 Sir William Phips sailed from Nantasket with a fleet of thirty sail, 2000 men and provisions for four months, bound for Quebec. Delay gave Frontenac, who had been advised of the expedition, time to strengthen his position. When the English fleet appeared before Quebec, on Oct. 16, the fortress was garrisoned by 2700 French regulars and militia. A demand for surrender was answered by a curt refusal. The English landing party was repulsed

and, bombardment failing, Phips realized the futility of his enterprise and sailed for home.

[Gilbert Parker, *Old Quebec*; J. Fenimore Cooper, *Naval History of United States*.] ROBERT W. BINGHAM

Quebec, Attack on (1776). See Arnold's March to Quebec; Canada, American Invasion of, 1775-76.

Quebec, Capture of (1759). The year following Louisburg's fall James Wolfe was given command of 9280 men, mostly regulars, with which, supplemented by naval aid, he was ordered to capture Quebec. Assembled at Louisburg in May, 1759, steadily drilled and trained, Wolfe's force sailed June 4, 1759, for the St. Lawrence. June 27 he landed on the Ile d'Orleans below Quebec and for two months, while the fleet dominated the river, made many abortive attempts against the city.

The French under Montcalm defended the north bank from the city to the Montmorency, a distance of seven miles; Wolfe went ashore east of this stream, and thus partially encircling Quebec with soldiers on the east, batteries on the south bank, and the fleet upstream, conducted a long-range bombardment and siege. July 31 he aimed a powerful but unsuccessful stroke by land and water at the Montmorency end of the French shore entrenchments. August was a month of discouragements.

September 1-3, the British skilfully abandoned the Montmorency camp. Wolfe secretly moved 3000 soldiers to the ships upstream. His fleet threatened several well-entrenched landing places. On the calm and cloudy night of Sept. 12, he slipped a strong force downstream in small boats, effected a surprise landing at a small cove near the city, overpowered a small guard, captured an adjacent battery, and made it possible for other troops, rowed over from the south shore and brought downstream by the ships themselves, to land safely and climb to the heights 5000 strong by six in the morning (see Abraham, Plains of).

In this position, Wolfe threatened Quebec's communications with Montreal and inner Canada and the bridge across the St. Charles. Montcalm had to assemble and fight for the possession of Quebec from the outside. In the formal 18th-century manner, Wolfe had his force arrayed by eight o'clock. Although skirmishing intervened, it was ten o'clock before Montcalm formed for a conventional assault. This was met by formal volleys from the British battalions. Shots were exchanged for a few moments only, then the French wavered, the British charged, and the

French fled. Wolfe was killed on the field. Montcalm was carried off mortally wounded. Wolfe's successor entrenched and closed in, and the surrender of Quebec on Sept. 17 made inevitable the conquest of Canada and the close of the French and Indian War⁹⁹ with the capture of Montreal⁹⁹ the following year.

[F. Parkman, *Montcalm and Wolfe*; J. C. Long, *Lord Jeffrey Amherst*; W. T. Waugh, *James Wolfe*; J. W. Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, Vol. II.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Quebec Act, THE (one of the Intolerable Acts⁹⁹), passed by Parliament in June, 1774, was intended to pacify the French-Canadians by granting the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion and re-establishing French civil law in Quebec. The boundaries of Quebec were extended to the Ohio on the south and to the Mississippi on the west, to be governed by an appointive governor and council without benefit of a representative legislative body. The interior was thereby closed to the expansion of the free institutions of the seaboard and the hopes of colonial land speculators were blasted. Colonial propagandists effectively used the Quebec Act to widen the breach between mother country and colonies by declaring that the British government intended to employ the "Popish slaves" of Quebec to establish the doctrines of royal absolutism and Roman Catholicism throughout the American colonies.

[Victor Coffin, *Province of Quebec and the Early American Revolution*.]

JOHN C. MILLER

Queen Anne's War was the American counterpart of the war of the Spanish Succession which was fought in Europe from 1701 to 1714. Fundamental issues, including the rivalry of France and England in America, had been left unsolved by the Treaty of Ryswick⁹⁹ (1697). They were revived upon the acceptance of the Spanish throne by a grandson of Louis XIV of France in November, 1700. The threat of Bourbon domination in Europe and in French and Spanish America caused William III of England and the Dutch Netherlands to ally (September, 1701) with the Holy Roman Emperor, a member of whose Hapsburg family claimed the Spanish throne. Two months after Anne had succeeded William as sovereign of England, the three allied powers jointly declared formal war on France (May, 1702).

In America the war was fought in the West Indies and on the Carolina and New England frontiers. In the summer of 1702 the English captured the island of St. Christopher, but Ad-

miral Benbow's action against a French squadron along the Spanish Main was indecisive. After the English failure to take Guadeloupe in 1703, military activity in the West Indies was restricted to privateering⁹⁹, from which English colonial trade suffered. In the autumn of 1702 South Carolinians destroyed the town, not the fort, of Spanish St. Augustine⁹⁹; and in 1706 a Franco-Spanish fleet was repulsed from the harbor of Charleston.

In the North, New England bore the brunt of the war against the French in Canada. Until 1709 neither New York nor England rendered material assistance. English settlements, including those at Wells, Saco, Deerfield⁹⁹, Reading, Sudbury and Haverhill, became the victims of barbarous French and Indian raids. After retaliatory attacks on Port Royal, led in 1704 by Benjamin Church and in 1707 by John March, had failed, the English colonists secured in 1709 Great Britain's promise of aid for expeditions against Quebec and Montreal. These projected campaigns under Samuel Vetch and Francis Nicholson were abandoned (October, 1709) after the promised British force had been diverted to Portugal. In the following year a British contingent, secured by Nicholson and Peter Schuyler in London, arrived. With that support colonial troops, led by Nicholson and Vetch, took Port Royal⁹⁹ in October, 1710. The capture of Port Royal, renamed Annapolis Royal, signified the fall of Acadia⁹⁹ to Great Britain.

The new Tory government in England, dominated by Harley and St. John and interested in obtaining the Asiento⁹⁹ for the projected South Sea Company, disavowed Marlborough's contention that the European fronts were alone decisive. That government sent Admiral Walker and Gen. Hill with military aid to support colonial troops in attacks on Quebec and Montreal. However, on Aug. 23, 1711, ten of the expedition's ships were wrecked with the loss of nearly 1000 men on the rocks above Anticosti. Thereupon Walker and Hill returned to England.

Meanwhile in 1711 peace negotiations had begun in Europe. In October, 1712, American colonial governors received a royal proclamation of an armistice; and in 1713 Queen Anne's War was concluded by the Treaty of Utrecht⁹⁹.

[E. B. Greene, *Provincial America*; F. Parkman, *A Half-Century of Conflict*; G. M. Trevelyan, *England under Queen Anne*.]

E. B. GRAVES

Queenston (Queenstown) Heights, Battle of (Oct. 13, 1812), the second serious reverse sustained by American arms in the disastrous campaign of 1812 (see War of 1812), arose out of the

attempt of Maj. Gen. Stephen Van Rensselaer to invade Canada across the Niagara River. The advanced units of the American force (which amounted in all to about 3100 men) successfully established themselves upon the steep escarpment overlooking the village of Queenston, and defeated the first attempts of the British forces to dislodge them. In one of these attempts the British commander, Maj. Gen. Isaac Brock, was killed. American hopes of victory, however, were dispelled by the refusal of the main body of American militia to cross the river to support the troops already engaged; and later in the day Maj. Gen. Sheaffe, upon whom the British command had devolved, collected a force of about 1000 men, gained the summit of the heights by a flanking movement and enveloped and captured the whole force which had crossed. The British reported the capture of 925 prisoners, of whom 417 were regulars, among them was Lt. Col. Winfield Scott. The Americans had about 90 men killed; the British had 14 killed, 77 wounded and 21 missing.

[Henry Adams, *History of the United States of America during the First Administration of James Madison*; Sir C. P. Lucas, *The Canadian War of 1812*.]

C. P. STACEY

Quids, THE, or Lewisites, were the last Livingston faction in New York (1806-9). Led by Gov. Morgan Lewis, they opposed DeWitt Clinton in his successful fight to control the Republican party (Jeffersonian)^{as} in the state following Aaron Burr's^{as} forced retirement after his duel with Alexander Hamilton. The Quids consisted of a minority of Republicans and most of the Federalists^{as}. The congressional supporters of John Randolph of Roanoke were also called Quids because Randolph was dubbed the *tertium quid*^{as} (March 13, 1806) in a House debate.

[Jabez D. Hammond, *The History of Political Parties in the State of New York*.]

DENIS TILDEN LYNCH

Quinteros Bay Episode, THE (Aug. 20, 1891), was one of the factors which caused the anti-United States feeling among the Chilean Congressionalists following the overthrow of President Balmaceda. The Valparaiso press charged that Rear Admiral Brown broke neutrality laws when, after observing the landing of rebel forces at Quinteros Bay, he was said to have reported the results of his activities to the government officials. Subsequent investigations have failed to show any impropriety in Brown's actions. At the time, however, he was bitterly criticized and this animosity finally expressed itself in the *Baltimore Affair*^{as}.

[H. C. Evans, *Chile and Its Relations with the United States*.]

OSGOOD HARDY

Quitrent, THE, originated in England from the commutation into a fixed money equivalent, of the annual food and labor payments due the lord of the manor. By the period of colonization the quitrents had become firmly established and were being enforced by distraint upon personal property, and in extreme cases by forfeiture of the land. As it was transplanted to the American colonies, the quitrent was a feudal due payable by freeholders to the proprietaries^{as} to whom the land had been granted. Later, after the proprietary rights were taken over, as in Virginia and the Carolinas, it became a crown revenue in the royal colonies^{as}.

Customarily, the right to charge quitrents was included in all the early charters. But in Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay the title to the land was soon vested in the freeholders, and this system of free tenure soon spread to the other New England colonies. So firmly did it become one of the "Liberties of New England," that an attempt to exact quitrents was one of the chief grievances in the overthrow of Gov. Andros (*see* New England, Dominion of). Quitrents were nominally due in all the American colonies outside of New England, but they were more effectively enforced in Pennsylvania and the colonies to the southward. Also, they were proposed, but not always collected, in the West Indies, in the Floridas, in Nova Scotia and in other outlying colonies, and were included in the several schemes to set up British colonies west of the Appalachians.

The annual amount of the quitrent was nominal, varying in individual colonies from 2s to 4s per 100 acres, with occasionally 1d per acre, yet payments became a frequent source of irritation. Distraint was the usual means of enforcement, and efforts to secure forfeiture of the land, where necessary, met with determined opposition. The medium of payment, likewise, stirred up much controversy. With specie scarce, it was necessary to use commodities, such as wheat, tobacco and other native products. Consequently, many disputes arose between the assemblies and the representatives of the proprietaries or the crown over the rate of exchange, grading, the cost of transportation and the place of payment. Actually, the quitrents produced a sizable revenue in the colonies in which they were enforced. In Pennsylvania, by 1776, nominally £10,204 7¾d was annually due, of which about a third was collected. In Maryland, in 1774, practically the entire rent roll, £8518 6s 2d, was being collect-

ed, but in Virginia, excluding the Northern Neck, which had been granted to Lord Culpeper, the net return from the quitrent in 1771 was only £3885 16s, not quite half the total rent roll. In South Carolina, toward the close of the colonial period, the annual return averaged between £2000 and £3000.

In both the proprietary and royal colonies the quitrents constituted an independent revenue for which there was no public accounting. But, especially as the Revolutionary period approached, they were collected with much less friction in the royal than in the proprietary colonies. As early as the Andros Rebellion in New England, colonial leaders appreciated the dangers inherent in a revenue that was altogether independent of popular control. After the outbreak of the Revolution the assemblies summarily ended these feudal dues upon the land, notably in Maryland where the Act of Abolition showed how galling this sign of perpetual dependence upon an absentee landlord had become. The quitrent, in short, was a feudal charge that was transferred to the American colonies, and the attempts to enforce it caused a constant irritation which had an important part in stirring up the Revolutionary spirit.

[B. W. Bond, Jr., *The Quit Rent System in the American Colonies*.]
BEVERLEY W. BOND, JR.

Quivira. See Coronado's Expedition; Gran Quivira.

Quo Warranto. As defined in *Corpus Juris*, "*Quo warranto* in its broadest sense is a proceeding to determine the right to the use or exercise of a franchise or office and to oust the holder from its enjoyment, if his claim is not well founded, or if he has forfeited his right to enjoy the privilege." This ancient writ was used to initiate proceedings for the forfeiture of the Massachusetts Bay charter^o in 1684 though the actual forfeiture resulted from a suit on a writ of *scire facias*. The writ has given way to the speedier "information in the nature of *quo warranto*" which has been used in hundreds of cases to determine the right of individuals to hold offices or of corporations to enjoy privileges under franchises. Generally *quo warranto* proceedings are not employed if other legal remedies are available. The proceedings, since about 1775, have been civil in character.

[C. M. Andrews, *Colonial Self-Government; Corpus Juris*, LI.]
ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Quota System, THE, was inaugurated by the enactment by Congress in 1921 of a law restrict-

ing emigration from a given country (excepting the Western Hemisphere and Asia) to 3% of the foreign-born from that country residing in the United States in 1910. In 1924 the percentage was reduced from three to two, and the quota base was changed from the census of 1910 to the census of 1890 (see Immigration Act of 1924). The "national origins" law, which became effective in 1929, fixed the maximum quota for all countries at 150,000 and the annual quota for each nationality at a number which bears the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 having that national origin bears to the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920. In determining the quotas the entire population—native and foreign-born—is taken into account, instead of only those born abroad. As in the two percentage laws, the minimum quota for each country was fixed at 100.

[R. L. Garis, *Immigration Restriction*; G. M. Stephenson, *A History of American Immigration*.]

G. M. STEPHENSON

Race Elements in America. In round numbers, the population of the United States according to the census of 1930 was somewhat under 123,000,000. Of this total, approximately 109,000,000 were whites and about 12,000,000 were Negroes. The other nonwhite elements totaled just over 2,000,000. Of these, 1,422,000 were Mexicans and 332,000 native Indians. Minor nonwhite elements were 75,000 Chinese, 139,000 Japanese and 50,000 miscellaneous. Reduced to percentages, this means, whites, 90%; Negroes, 9%; other nonwhite, 1%.

Although the Oriental still occasions minor difficulties on the Pacific coast, restriction of Oriental immigration, begun with the Chinese Exclusion Act^o more than half a century ago and since extended to include all Asiatics, has become a fixed policy. Therefore, the Oriental will seemingly never be more than a local problem. Much the same is true of Mexican immigration. The Mexican peon may be a disturbing factor in the Southwestern states, but he is unlikely vitally to affect the country as a whole.

The one great racial dilemma which confronts the United States is the relations of white and Negro^o. This thorny question is, of course, an old one which has confronted America since colonial times. It is specifically discussed under a separate topic, *The Race Problem^o*.

Turning now to the make-up of the white population, we find that America started out as a land inhabited almost exclusively by colonists from the British Isles. And despite the highly varied mass-immigration of the 19th and

early 20th centuries, our present white population is predominantly of north and west European origin. Our racial composition has not radically changed since colonial days.

At the outbreak of the Revolution, the white population of the thirteen colonies numbered about 2,000,000. Of this total, 75% were of straight English stock, while more than half of the balance were from other parts of the British Isles—mostly Scots, including the transplanted Scots of Ulster, known as Scotch-Irish[™]. Thus the colonial population was fully 90% British in origin. The only considerable non-British elements were the Germans[™], settled mostly in Pennsylvania, and the Dutch of New York and New Jersey. A sprinkling of French Huguenots[™] virtually completed the total.

The racial make-up of the colonial population is not merely of historical interest, it is a matter of vital present importance. Planted on the fringe of an empty continent, the colonists bred with amazing rapidity amid their limitless opportunities for expansion. Furthermore, from the Revolution down to the middle of the 19th century (a period covering fully two generations), immigration[™] was negligible. This meant that the pioneer peopling of America, right across the continent to the Pacific coast, was done almost exclusively by the colonial stock, which thus kept up its rapid multiplication and became the vital basis of nearly every part of the United States. What this signifies in numbers alone is vividly shown by the exhaustive studies made by the Census Bureau in its analysis of the ethnic make-up of the population in order to implement the national origins clause of the Immigration Act of 1924[™]. The Bureau estimated that 49.9% of all the white blood in America is of the old colonial stock. According to the census of 1920, this is quantitatively equivalent to 47,000,000 persons, and in 1930 it had presumably risen to at least 54,000,000. Of course, this does not mean that there are that many persons of unmixed colonial descent. It does mean, however, that colonial blood strongly leavens every part of the country, while in certain sections, especially the South and large parts of the West, the population is almost wholly descended from colonial strains.

Mass immigration did not begin until the late 1840's, when the potato famine in Ireland and political upheavals in Germany (*see* Forty-Eighters) produced a vast exodus of Irish[™] and Germans to America. During the Civil War, the immigrant influx slackened, but thereafter it again swelled to even greater volume, until, by the year 1890, over 15,000,000 immigrants had

entered America. During this period, Ireland and Germany consistently sent great numbers, while Scandinavia entered the picture in a big way. It must not be forgotten that Great Britain remained a major source of immigration, as it had been since the earliest colonial days.

The year 1890 marks the dividing-line between what is termed the "Old" and the "New" immigration. Up to that time, immigration, while tremendous in volume, had come from the traditional sources—northern and western Europe. Thus, the racial make-up of our population was not perceptibly altered. After 1890, however, immigration from southern and eastern Europe rose so rapidly that, by the turn of the century, it accounted for more than half the annual total, while by 1914 it was running between 75% and 80% of the whole. Russia, Italy, Austria-Hungary and the Balkans sent us many millions of immigrants who settled mostly in the North-eastern states, especially in the cities and industrial centers.

During the World War, immigration from Europe fell off drastically, chiefly owing to lack of transportation, but thereafter it rose rapidly and showed signs of breaking new records. However, the American people resolved to stop mass immigration, and did so by a series of restrictive measures culminating in the Johnson Act, which cut the influx to 150,000 per annum, apportioned according to the national origins clause (*see* Quota System). Unless this restrictive policy should be changed, the ethnic make-up of our white population can be considered effectively stabilized, so far as immigration is concerned.

According to its survey made in the mid-1920's, the Census Bureau estimated that our white population consisted of 49.9% Colonial Stock, 35% Old Immigrant Stock, 14% New Immigrant Stock, and 1% French-Canadian Stock. Combining the Colonial and Old Immigrant elements, this gives 85% of the total with north and west European origins. Translated into figures, the south and east European elements in our population totaled about 14,000,000 in 1920; while in 1930, they did not much exceed 16,000,000.

Regarding internal population trends and prospects, it is interesting to note that the natural increase of the New Immigrant stocks, at first so rapid, is falling off sharply. Mostly city dwellers, the Americanized second and third generations limit their families much like their neighbors of Colonial or Old Immigrant descent. Birth rates remain generally higher throughout the countryside, where the New Immigration did not usually go. Furthermore, the purely Anglo-Saxon South has the highest increase. All this indicates

that America is destined to become more predominantly of north and west European blood, the elements from southern and eastern Europe not gaining proportionately and remaining chiefly localized in the northeastern section of the country where they originally settled.

[Clinton S. Burr, *America's Race Heritage*, Madison Grant, *The Conquest of a Continent*, Lothrop Stoddard, *Reforming America*.]

LOTHROP STODDARD

Race Problem, THE. As the term is commonly employed in the United States, it denotes the problem of the Negro[™] and his relations with the white majority. In the larger sense, this problem has been present from the start, since Negro slaves from Africa were imported into the American colonies in their earliest days. However, the "race problem," as we today understand the term, dates really from the Civil War. Previously there was a slavery[™] problem, but hardly a race problem in its present sense. Down to emancipation, the Negroes were a servile caste, sharply fenced off by law as well as custom from the white population. Even the small group of Free Negroes[™], though exempt from slavery, had the legal status of "freedmen" rather than of full-fledged citizens. This special legal status of the Negro, slave or free, was the formal expression of a traditional American attitude toward race. From early colonial times public opinion has been practically unanimous in its determination to preserve white race-integrity by a strict color line. Indeed, the color line is the oldest and most firmly established of American policies. It has also been successful in its primary objective, because for three centuries it has maintained white race-integrity even in regions where whites have been a minority among a dense Negro population.

At the close of the colonial period there were 500,000 Negroes in America, 20% of the total population. Since slavery had proved unprofitable in the Northern colonies, most of the Negroes were concentrated in the South, especially in South Carolina and Georgia, where they far outnumbered the whites. Washington, Jefferson and other eminent Southerners of the Revolutionary period disapproved of slavery and hoped for its gradual abandonment. It was the invention of the cotton gin, which made slavery extremely profitable, that established the peculiar institution as the basis of Southern economic life down to the Civil War (*see* Plantation System of the South).

Emancipation shattered the entire structure of the Old South, while the tragic experiment known as Reconstruction[™] deepened and prolonged the chaotic confusion which followed the

collapse of the Confederacy. From this long turmoil, a new South gradually emerged, once more under local white control (*see* Home Rule, Restoration of, in the South). The grim ordeal, however, had deeply estranged the races and embittered their relations. It was a bad start for any working out of the race problem.

In this unfortunate situation, the Negro was unquestionably the chief sufferer. Though theoretically full-fledged citizens, the emancipated slaves were too poor, ignorant and undisciplined to take advantage of their legal opportunities. Only gradually did a minority attain education, property and self-respect. The mass of Southern Negroes have remained poverty-stricken and backward. During the past few decades an immense exodus of Negroes to the North has taken place, mostly to the cities and industrial centers. The same cityward trend is visible in the South, so that today over one third of the entire Negro population is urban. Yet, in city and country alike, the Negro tends to be at the bottom of the economic scale.

All this denotes that the Negroes are not successfully fitting themselves into the framework of American economic life. And this failure has had obvious consequences upon their racial situation. By and large, they have lost in average health and vigor since emancipation. The slaves, as valuable chattels, were usually well looked-after, and bred rapidly. Left to themselves, the Negroes have become far more diseased than the whites. City life bears especially hard upon them. Their rate of increase is today much less than that of the white population. Therefore, though still growing in numbers, the Negroes are becoming a smaller factor. In 1860 they formed 17% of the total population. Today they are barely 9%.

In the South, interracial relations seem to be relatively stabilized under a system of strict segregation. From birth to death, whites and Negroes live separate lives, with a minimum of social contacts. This system may best be described as Bi-Racialism. The color line is drawn vertically through the social order, from top to bottom. Yet it is not a caste division, since Negroes can rise freely to the top—on their side of the line. Southern Negrodom has tacitly acquiesced in this arrangement, and race friction is lessened by mutual efforts typified by the Commission on Inter-Racial Co-operation. In the North, conditions are more fluid and unstable. The Negro masses in Northern cities voice much discontent and tend toward radicalism.

The weight of evidence seems to prove that far less white blood is entering the Negro group than

was the case under slavery. The number of light mulattoes^{qv} is certainly less than in former times. Indeed, the Negro group seems to be stabilizing itself as a brown-skinned stock, with fewer extremes of color at either end of the scale.

What the eventual outcome of the Negro-White dilemma will be cannot be foretold. Theoretically, there are only two complete solutions: amalgamation; or Negro deportation—either from the entire United States or to some area set apart for them within its borders. But neither of these logical outcomes is today practical. The chances are that the color line will be maintained and will continue to function fairly effectively, though with much interracial friction and possibilities of serious trouble.

[Jerome Dowd, *The Negro in American Life; The New Negro* (Collaboration); Thomas J. Woofter, *The Basis of Racial Readjustment*.]

LOTHROP STODDARD

Race Riots. The conflicts of groups having widely different racial or cultural backgrounds have in the United States from time to time shown themselves in riots and in lynching^{qv}. Race riots have not been confined to those possessing different characteristics in the anthropological sense of race, although outbreaks between Negroes and whites have been most common. The basic cause has been a clashing of interests in which usually the economic motive has predominated. The conflict has come either from the suppressed race revolting against its hardships and turning to violence, or from members of the dominant race resenting the attempt of the socially inferior group to gain greater equality. Riots between Negroes and whites have in the United States chiefly resulted from the second.

The occasion of the riot, taken by itself, usually has been trivial. Some individual happening, occasionally a mere accident or misunderstanding, has acted as the spark, and the emotionally prepared disposition has burst into flame. Young white men, living in poverty and with little education, have usually started the trouble in communities where they and members of the Negro race have been in close contact and in economic competition.

There were few riots in colonial America before the Revolutionary War. Since then the most serious have been: in Boston, 1837, natives and Irish; in Philadelphia, 1838, whites and Negroes; in San Francisco, in the 1870's, hoodlums and the Chinese (*see* Kearneyites); in New Orleans, 1891, natives and Italians (*see* Mafia Incident); in East Saint Louis, Ill., 1917, whites and Negroes; in Chicago, 1919, whites and Negroes.

The last two were local wars against Negroes, caused by the rapid influx of unskilled Negro workers from the South and the feeling of the whites that their jobs were menaced.

Race rioting in the United States cannot be understood unless related to the lack of respect for law (*see* Lawlessness) which has been a major flaw in the history of the nation.

[Arthur F. Raper, *The Tragedy of Lynching*; Thomas J. Woofter, Jr., *The Basis of Racial Adjustment*.]

ERNEST R. GROVES

Race Suicide. A term first used by Edward Alsworth Ross in 1905 (*Foundations of Sociology*), and given wide currency by President Theodore Roosevelt, meaning the quantitative decline of a "race" or stock of population through reduction of its birth rate. Such a decline, while long regarded simply as a threatened danger, is now becoming an actuality as regards the native American stock in large cities, in the Northeastern states, and the more educated classes; and will be true of the whole American population by 1980 if present birth trends continue.

[W. S. Thompson and P. K. Whelpton, *Population Trends in the United States*; Frank Lorimer and Frederick Osborn, *Dynamics of Population*.]

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM

Rackets and Racketeers. Long before 1880 the word racket was a slang term for a swindling trick regularly practised, as, for example, a mail-order fraud. But the racket, in the 20th-century sense of the word, actually existed in the large cities, even then, in the toll levied on prostitution and gambling^{qv} by the law-enforcement machinery, dominated by corrupt politicians. Though long used in the underworld, not until after 1925 did the word racket come into common use as indicating (a) an elaborate swindling game, such as giving bogus tips on the races; (b) philanthropic, religious, civic or reform movements reputedly, or really, conducted for the aggrandizement of their operators; (c) the taking possession of a business or industry by a criminal gang or their levying regular tribute upon it under pretense of "protecting" it. If it refused to pay, its property might be wrecked or set afire, its employees beaten, its head himself beaten or killed or his home bombed. Racketeers obtained control of labor unions or organized spurious unions. Racketeers fired buildings or committed burglaries for businessmen who wished to defraud insurance companies or the Federal Government. A thug even attempted in 1927 to organize the Chicago physicians into a "protective association," proposing to abolish free clinics and baby welfare stations and the Public Health Institute. Rackets have tortured New York's poultry market during more than

three decades of the 20th century, with sabotage, arson and occasional murder as weapons. In Chicago during the Prohibition^{er} era, Alphonse Capone came to be reputed the colossus of racketeers, monopolizing liquor sales and slot machines, forcing "speakeasies" to buy everything they used from him and to have their washing done in his laundries; controlling certain labor unions, city, county and state officials, even, it is said, a congressman. In 1931 he was sent to prison for a long term for income-tax evasion. In New York, 1925-35, there were rackets in laundries, poultry, milk and other foods, ice, cut flowers, window-washing, jewelry and many manufactures—while those in liquors were enormous. In one year twelve large, new apartment buildings were gutted by fire just before their completion because their owners had failed to pay for "protection." Killings in the private wars of the liquor racketeers were commonplace, those of "Legs" Diamond in 1931 and "Dutch Schultz" (Arthur Flegenheimer) in 1935 being notable. Thomas E. Dewey, appointed special prosecutor for New York County in 1935 and elected District Attorney in 1937, broke up several rackets, among them those in prostitution and "policy" (a lottery game), and sent a number of their most prominent figures to prison.

[National Commission on Law Enforcement and Observance, Wickersham Commission, *Reports*, 1931; Fred D. Pasley, *Muscling In*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Radical Republicans were extremists who strongly influenced Union policy in Civil War days and became dominant during Reconstruction^{er}. Their main characteristics were antislavery zeal as a political instrument, moralizing unctious, rebel-baiting intolerance and hunger for power. From the beginning these men made trouble for Lincoln by demanding a radical Cabinet, rallying round Frémont in his most embarrassing maneuvers, intriguing against McClellan, denouncing West Point officers and pressing for a war of legislation against Southerners as persons. Their distrust of military expertness was combined with eagerness to seize the reins of army management. In their Committee on the Conduct of the War^{er} they used the weapon of congressional investigation^{er}, with deadly effect, to ruin the usefulness of valuable generals (e.g., McClellan, Fitz-John Porter, Charles P. Stone), while their own military pets were urged for high command. Typical of their spirit and method was the second Confiscation (or treason) Act^{er} of 1862 by which the private property of Southerners as "rebels" was made

subject to sweeping forfeiture. Lincoln disapproved of this bill and planned to veto it, but by a last-minute arrangement his unwilling signature was obtained. After the law was passed the Lincoln administration did little to enforce it. It was thus, in general, with Lincoln. He disapproved of the Radicals (or "Jacobins," as John Hay called them) but was in part swept along with them. The reconstruction issue found Lincoln in utter disagreement and hopeless deadlock with these "ultras" of his party, who showed clearly in 1864 that they did not wish his re-nomination.

Among the leaders of the Radicals may be mentioned Sumner, Wade, Stevens, Zachariah Chandler, Henry Winter Davis, J. A. Logan, James M. Ashley, Boutwell and Julian. By 1866 these vindictives had made themselves masters of Congress through the Republican party^{er} (now no longer a Lincoln party) and the drastic Reconstruction regime was peculiarly their work. In this they encountered the determined resistance of President Johnson, and the height of Radical vengefulness was reached in the almost successful effort to remove him on impeachment^{er}. As used in this article, the term "Radical" does not mean "liberal." The Radicals had small regard for civil rights^{er}, and some of their fiercest denunciations were hurled at the Supreme Court for upholding civil rights (in the North) in the Milligan case^{er} of 1866. Historians now recognize that there was an economic motive in Radical policy, for their control of the National Government favored Northeastern manufacturing and financial interests against those of the West and South.

[Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction*; Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln*.]

J. G. RANDALL

Radical Rule in the South began in 1868 and 1870 when the government of ten Southern states was assumed by officials believing in equal rights to the Negroes (see Reconstruction Acts). The main support of the new regimes was 931,000 newly enfranchised freedmen^{er} who, under prevailing conditions, formed majorities in five states and who had effective and unscrupulous leadership in the Carpetbaggers^{er}. These Northern adventurers frightened the blacks with stories of white conspiracies against freedom, and stimulated hopes of overcoming the social and economic inequalities normally imposed upon Negroes in this country. The freedmen wanted to use their political rights as a means of securing land, education and even social equality.

The Radical governments accomplished cer-

tain constructive reforms. They established modern state constitutions and the principles of universal education and of equality before the law. There were visions of a truly Radical program designed to give the blacks opportunity to participate fully in the social and economic as well as the political rights of American citizenship. But such plans were overshadowed by the unparalleled incompetence and venality of the leaders. Illiterate field hands became legislators and minor officials, vying with each other in accepting bribes. Many of the carpetbag governors were corrupt and those who were personally honest were vindictive and unscrupulous in politics. Extravagant expenditures, heavy taxes and extensive increases in bonded debts were universal. Part of the public revenues was used for legitimate purposes, but the rest filled the pockets of embezzlers and thieves who garishly spent their gains. A continuation of a previously inaugurated policy of endorsing railroad bonds by the state was a fruitful source of easy money for the dishonest official and crooked speculator. Bonds were sometimes endorsed for roads which were never constructed. In extenuation of Radical rule it should be said that it was only one example of the several national political scandals of the post-bellum era and that its baneful effects were narrowly political. No successful attempt was made to subvert Southern society, and disorders in statehouses did not prevent notable progress in economic and social spheres.

Between 1869 and 1877 the Radical state governments collapsed. This process was hastened by divisions in Radical ranks and by the gradual withdrawal of Northern support because of the conviction that Negro rule was both scandalous and impractical. But the principal cause was the unrelenting opposition of the normally dominant white caste to an experiment which challenged Southern conceptions of the proper relations between races. As soon as the whites had recovered from the demoralization caused by war and the initial phases of Radical Reconstruction, they exercised their superior powers of organization to put an end to Negro rule (*see* Home Rule, Restoration of, in the South). The scandals of carpetbagging and Negroism were used to justify this action, but it would have come had the Radical governments been models of rectitude.

[W. L. Fleming, *The Sequel of Appomattox.*]

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS

Radicals and Radicalism in the United States. The word radical derives from the Latin, *radix*, meaning root. It is applied indiscriminately to persons, doctrines and institutions. It connotes

the idea of going to the root of a matter, and when used with reference to political, social, economic, or other doctrines signifies proposals to alter fundamentally the established order. The trilogy, radicalism-liberalism-conservatism, may refer to different elements in one social movement or characterize the dominant elements in distinct movements. The word is sometimes used to discredit a person or a cause as being irrational, extreme or revolutionary. There exist no criteria for determining whether a person or doctrine is radical except in terms of other persons or doctrines. The symbol is always relative and its specific connotation varies with time, place and the person using the term. Attempts to prove the existence of definite radical personality types and specify their traits have been inconclusive for this reason. As generally used, the word is a convenient device for labeling persons or doctrines which are actually or supposedly atypical.

The symbol appeared during the middle of the 18th century to describe attempts made to reform the British Parliament. It was widely used after the Napoleonic wars with reference to Chartists and supporters of the First Reform Bill. In America it was frequently used to characterize leaders and supporters of the American Revolution. Radical tendencies have prevailed throughout American history. Early examples were the "Workies," a labor party organized in New York in 1829 and the "loco focos"^{qv} appearing in 1835. Following the Civil War the term assumed a specialized meaning referring to certain Republicans in Congress, notably Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner, who favored a vindictive and punitive Reconstruction policy in the South (*see* Radical Republicans). In practically every field of human activity—religion, art, science, philosophy, as well as business and politics—the word has been used to stigmatize extremists with varying degrees of definiteness. In politics and economics it usually refers to extremists of the Left rather than the Right, Communists^{qv} rather than Fascists, for example.

Political and economic radicalism in the United States is largely the story of industrial and agrarian discontent reflected in the appearance of numerous minor parties, organizations and associations advocating fundamental changes in the American political and economic system. The American trade-union movement, the American Federation of Labor (1886), the Knights of Labor (1869), the Greenbackers, the Free Silverites, the leaders and followers of the Populist Revolt, Single Taxers and the followers of Henry George and Edward Bellamy, the Roosevelt Progressives, the Farmers' Alliances, the Farmer-

Labor movement of the 1920's, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Townsendites and many supporters of the New Deal illustrate movements or groups that have been labeled radical⁹⁹. Since the formation of the Socialist party in 1901, the rise and fall of the Industrial Workers of the World (1905), and the formation of the American branch of the Communist party in 1919, Marxists of varying hues have been regarded as the predominant type of American social, political and economic radicalism⁹⁹. During and since the World War, radicalism has tended to become synonymous with Communist, Bolshevik, "red."

The rise and fall of radicalism is a function of fluctuations in social norms. Many ideas once popularly described as radical have lost that connotation. Schools of interior decorating, philosophy, æsthetics, as well as economic reform, arise only to have some of their tenets assimilated, others discarded. Woman suffrage, Federal income taxes, popular election of United States senators, proportional representation, collective bargaining and social insurance⁹⁹ are a few examples of accepted public policies once labeled radical. Radicalism tends to flourish in a democratic setting with its emphasis upon freedom of expression; to atrophy in an atmosphere of authoritarianism. It often evidences the vitality of social life, and is frequently the stimulus to change and progress in democratic and humanitarian terms.

[Henry Seidel Canby, *Radical America*, in *Century*, September, 1919; Samuel Crowther, *Radical Propaganda—How It Works*, in *World's Work*, April, 1920; Henry Jones Ford, *Radicalism in American Politics*, in *Tale Review*, July, 1920; Frederick Emory Haynes, *Social Politics in the United States*; Edwin W. Hullinger, *Radicalism in the United States*, in *Scribner's Magazine*, October, 1924; Clayton R. Lusk, *Radicalism under Inquiry*, in *Review of Reviews*, February, 1920; Attorney General Palmer, *The Case against the "Reds,"* in *Forum*, February, 1920; Walter Edward Weyle, *Tired Radicals, and Other Papers*; Albert Benedict Wolfe, *Conservatism, Radicalism, and Scientific Method.*]

HARWOOD L. CHILDS

Radio. Before the World War radio was used primarily for experimental, commercial and maritime purposes. Successful wireless communication dates from the invention of the three-electrode vacuum tube by Dr. Lee DeForest in 1906. The importance of the radio in wartime led to the assumption of control over it in this country by the Federal Government and to important technical developments. With the encouragement and assistance of the United States Government, the Radio Corporation of America was formed and incorporated as a Delaware corporation, Oct. 17, 1919.

Since the World War, in addition to many rapid technical changes which have improved the process of transmission and reception, notable developments have been: (1) the rapid increase until 1927 in the number of transmitting stations; (2) the growing use of receiving sets; (3) the creation of broadcasting chains; (4) extension of governmental control, (5) increasing use as a medium for advertising, educational, governmental purposes; (6) development of international broadcasts; (7) advent of television; (8) serious study of the social implications of this rapidly expanding institution.

The first preannounced broadcast in this country, as distinct from other types of wireless transmission, is credited to Station KDKA, Pittsburgh, Nov. 2, 1920. From then until 1927, the number of broadcasting stations increased rapidly: 382 in 1922, 573 in 1923; 732 in 1927. On May 1, 1938, there were 733 stations in operation or under construction. Approximately fifty stations are owned by nonprofit organizations—educational, religious, labor, municipal. One of the significant developments of recent years has been the increasing ownership by newspapers. On Jan. 1, 1938, there were 178 stations in the United States owned in whole, majority, or equal parts by newspaper interests and 30 in which newspapers held a minority interest.

Accompanying the growth in the number of broadcasting stations has been an equally significant growth in the number and use of receiving sets: 60,000 in 1922; 1,500,000 in 1923; 6,500,000 in 1927; 17,000,000 in 1932, 27,000,000 in 1938. It is estimated that three fourths of all sets are in use at some time each day; that the average set is in operation about three hours daily, and that the potential listening audience in the United States is over 50,000,000.

To improve the quality of programs, to increase the size of the listening audience, and to promote sales of receiving sets and equipment, the Radio Corporation of America established the National Broadcasting Company in 1926. In June, 1938, there were 146 stations in the United States receiving N. B. C. programs. In 1927 a rival chain, the Columbia Broadcasting System, was established, to be followed a few years later by the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Government regulation of radio began in 1912. The rapid growth of the industry after 1920, resulting in intense competition and frustrating progress toward better programs and improved reception, finally led to the passage of the Radio Act of 1927, the first real attempt by Congress to deal with the whole problem. This act created a Federal Radio Commission with definite respon-

sibility for regulating broadcasting. In 1934 this Commission was superseded by a Federal Communications Commission⁷⁰ with authority to regulate all communication by telegraph, telephone, cable or radio. One of the important powers of the Commission is its power to license broadcasting stations for six-month periods.

In contrast to the situation in most countries, radio in the United States is almost wholly privately owned and operated for profit. The total amount of radio advertising has steadily and rapidly increased. Of the total amount of money spent for national advertising in the United States, about 14.7% was for radio advertising in 1937 as contrasted to 5.3% in 1930. To increase advertising revenue and the size of listening audiences, radio programs emphasize presentations with maximum popular appeal—music, entertainment, news reports. According to a survey issued by the Federal Communications Commission in June, 1938, the percentage of radio time devoted to various types of programs for the country as a whole was: Music, 52.45; Dramatic, 9.11; Variety, 8.84; Talks and Dialogues, 11.41; News, 8.55; Religion, 5.15; Special events, 2.21; Miscellaneous, 2.28.

A perplexing problem of radio policy is the equitable allocation of radio time, not only to political parties but to the multiplicity of groups seeking to use the medium for propaganda⁷¹ purposes. It is difficult to determine the extent to which trends in program content signify an increased use for educational purposes, due to the lack of a generally accepted definition of the word education. The use of radio by schools, colleges and other institutions of learning has not kept pace with its use by other groups.

The development of international short-wave broadcasts in co-operation with the broadcasting systems of other countries is an important feature of radio history. A distinction between international broadcasts, based on international agreements and arrangements, must be made from broadcasts designed to surmount national barriers, irrespective of the wishes of the receiving country. This latter type of international broadcast, usually propagandistic in character, has given rise to a disturbing kind of propaganda warfare.

The actual, as well as the potential, significance of radio as an institution affecting the course of history and social change in the United States is dimly perceived. The United States Department of Education, certain philanthropic foundations and educational institutions and the radio industry itself, have co-operated to further broad studies of the social and educational im-

plications of radio. Its social significance is certainly affected by its potentialities as a medium of mass communication, the immediacy and universality of its contact with the masses, its susceptibility as a medium for dramatic and emotional appeals, and its entertainment, cultural and propagandistic possibilities.

[Hadley Cantril and G. W. Allport, *Psychology of Radio*; Federal Radio Commission, *Annual Reports*; Federal Communications Commission, *Annual Reports*; S. E. Frost, Jr., *Is American Radio Democratic?*; Radio: The Fifth Estate, in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 177, January, 1935; O. W. Riegel, *Mobilizing for Chaos: The Story of the New Propaganda*; Laurence F. Schmeckebier, *The Federal Radio Commission, Its History, Activities and Organization*.]

HARWOOD L. CHILDS

Radio in Politics. In the eight years between 1920 and 1928 radio became a major political factor. It made possible access to millions of voters who seldom attended party meetings or read political news. A "good radio voice" became a valuable asset for a candidate. The radio has undoubtedly had adverse effects on the old-time party rally and the old-time orator although a new type of demagogue has taken his place. Radio listeners, however, do not have to listen; appeals must be carefully framed; and the costs are so heavy that ordinarily time cannot be wasted. Government control and regulation through administrative agencies open up the possibility of intimidation of broadcasters in the interests of the party in power (*see* Federal Communications Commission). Possible revocation of license is a powerful weapon and in the campaign of 1936⁷² it was charged that it had been brought into play. Public opinion, however, with its tradition of free speech⁷³, demands fair play, equality of treatment and general decency.

[H. R. Bruce, *American Parties and Politics*; J. G. Kerwin, *The Control of Radio*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Radisson's Relation. Pierre Esprit Radisson was long thought to have been one of the two traders sent by Gov. Jean de Lauson of New France⁷⁴ in 1654 to seek out and get the trade of the Huron, Ottawa and other Western tribes that had been scattered by the Iroquois in the later 1640's and early 1650's. It is now regarded as certain that he was in Quebec in 1655, since a document of that date, signed by him there, has been found. He could not have been on the expedition, therefore, for it consumed two years. His brother-in-law, Médard Chouart, Sieur des Groseilliers, does appear to have been one of the governor's two men. It is probably Chouart's story that Radisson has given in his *Voyages*, de-

rived in all likelihood from Chouart's oral accounts of his trip into and about Lake Huron and Lake Michigan. The book was printed from a manuscript, written about the year 1669, which is a defective, contemporary translation of an original French document now lost. The translation is among the papers of Samuel Pepys in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

Radisson's account of the trip is inaccurate, confused and ambiguous, but it does give an inkling of the culture of the Indians and of trade methods in the West at a very early date. Other parts of the same manuscript are the narratives of two of Radisson's sojourns among the Iroquois in the 1650's and a trip made by Radisson and Des Groseilliers in 1659 and 1660 from their homes in Trois Rivières on the lower St. Lawrence to the end of Lake Superior and even a little south and west of that lake. This account is fairly detailed, exact and explicit. Its chief value lies in its descriptions of Indians before they were influenced by white men. On this trip the two men learned from the Indians of an easy route for fur-trading from Hudson Bay to the great beaver country northwest of Lake Superior, and of a supposed Northwest Passage⁷ in that area. It was these ideas that led the two men successively to France, New England and Old England in an endeavor to get aid to explore the possibilities of Hudson Bay, both for trade and for finding a route to Asia. In England they succeeded. Here, after many disappointments, the Hudson's Bay Company⁸ was founded on May 2, 1670, after Des Groseilliers' return from a successful trip to Hudson Bay in 1668 and 1669. The two explorers' lives between 1670 and Radisson's death in 1710 do not touch the history of the United States closely, though they are full of significance for English and French empires in North America, for Canada, and for the Hudson's Bay Company.

[Gideon D. Scull, ed., *Voyages of Peter Esprit Radisson*; Grace Lee Nute, an unpublished biography of Radisson and Des Groseilliers.]

GRACE LEE NUTE

Rafting, Early. In the period before the Civil War, and chiefly on the rivers of the Mississippi Valley⁹, rafts with crude lean-tos were used as a means of transportation downstream by the poorer immigrants. They were steered by long sweeps and appear to have been a perennial menace to navigation. Some immigrants built rafts or saw logs with the intention of selling them to the sawmills down river, other such rafts were used to transport cattle, forage and lumber products for sale, together with the logs, in the lower cities. When the rafts reached their desti-

nation they were usually broken up and sold as lumber.

[Leland D. Baldwin, *Keelboat Age on Western Waters*.]
LELAND D. BALDWIN

Rail Making and Rail Fences. For many years following first settlement in America, rail fences were common. Tree trunks easy to split were abundant, and an axe was the only tool necessary to make rails and fence. Rails could be split with an axe and wooden wedges made with an axe. Pine, oak and chestnut were favorite woods for rails, the tree trunks being cut into 11-foot lengths. A 10- or 12-inch log would make five or six rails, all three-cornered; a 20- or 24-inch log would turn out twelve to eighteen rails, those next the heart of the log three-cornered, those outside four-cornered, all four or five inches through. The ground rails, laid zigzag, were the "worm"; the top rails, the "riders." The worm zigzagged across the line two feet or more on each side, the fence thus covering a strip of land five feet wide. If stakes were dug in at the corners to support the riders, they toed out still farther. In a cap-fence, upright stakes (posts) clamped each corner and the worm was more nearly straight. The caps were short clapboards, with an auger hole in each end, fitted down over the tops of the posts, holding them together. The best rail fences came last—straight on the line, with the ends of the rails mortised into heavy posts. Soldiers in the Revolution, the War of 1812 and the Civil War found old dry fence rails handy for campfires, and burned millions of them.

JOHN W. WAYLAND

"Rail Splitter." The term originated in the Illinois State Republican Convention at Decatur, May 9, 1860, when Richard J. Oglesby and John Hanks marched into the convention hall with two fence rails placarded, "Abraham Lincoln, The Rail Candidate for President in 1860." The sobriquet caught on at the national convention at Chicago, spread quickly over the North, and became a valuable campaign asset.

[W. E. Baringer, *Lincoln's Rise to Power*.]

PAUL M. ANGLE

Railroad Administration, United States (1918-20) In April, 1917, railroad executives had formed an advisory Railroads' War Board in an attempt to achieve a co-ordinated "continental railway system" for the World War¹⁰ emergency. There resulted some pooling of freight cars and coal supplies, but without governmental intervention it was difficult to unify other transportation resources and almost impossible to obtain adequate financial assistance. Therefore in December, 1917, President Wilson, in a proclama-

tion authorized by an act of Aug. 29, 1916, placed the control and operation of all rail transport under a Railroad Administration, for the duration of the war. These facilities were "leased" by the Government, and eventually comprised 532 properties with 366,000 miles of track, evaluated at \$18,000,000,000. Terminal companies, an express company, and certain coastal and inland waterways and piers were included, but not street cars, interurban lines, or industrial railroads. In general, the personnel and administrative machinery of each property was retained, under the direct charge of a Federal manager, usually an officer of the corporation. Operations were co-ordinated by regional directors, who in turn were under the Director General (W. G. McAdoo, and later W. D. Hines) and a central administration at Washington.

This episode of government enterprise was intended to be an emergency military measure to help win the war, and was not regarded as a socialist experiment. However, certain efficiencies and economies did result, and competitive wastes were eliminated by centralization and standardization. Unified terminals were organized, notably at Chicago, and a "permit system" prevented loading until assurances for unloading were given by shippers. Locomotives and freight cars were standardized, and the purchasing of equipment and supplies was centralized. Repair shops and maintenance were pooled. A coal zoning plan helped to eliminate fuel wastes (*see* Fuel Administration). Passenger service, while discouraged because of the war, was unified by such devices as consolidated ticket offices, the universal mileage book, and standard ticket forms and baggage rules. Finally, advertising was eliminated and statistics were standardized. Expenditures totaling \$1,120,000,000 were made by the Government, mostly for additions, betterments and equipment. By the act of March 21, 1918, stock- and bond-holders were guaranteed compensation equal to the average annual net operating income during the preceding three years, 1914-17. Wages were generally increased, and the Administration formally recognized the eight-hour day for 2,000,000 railroad employees. In March, 1920, sixteen months after the Armistice⁹⁹, the railroads were returned to private management, under the supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission and in accordance with the Transportation Act of 1920⁹⁹.

[F. H. Dixon, *Railroads and Government, 1910-1921*; W. D. Hines, *War History of American Railroads*.]

MARTIN P. CLAUSSEN

Railroad Brotherhoods. The Big Four Brotherhoods are the Locomotive Engineers (1863),

Railroad Conductors (1868), Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen (1873) and Railway Trainmen (1883). Because of their traditional conservatism, rather superior quality of membership, and determined policy to keep aloof from other phases of the American labor movement, the brotherhoods are considered the "aristocracy" of American unionism. They were organized as mutual insurance or benefit societies, not as labor unions. The risks of railroading were so great that commercial companies found extremely high rates for coverage imperative. The brotherhoods were established to provide cheaper insurance. Through skilful management of funds surpluses accumulated, which in turn enhanced protection. Collective bargaining⁹⁹ was gradually added to the functions of the various brotherhoods, but insurance benefits undoubtedly continued to be responsible for growth of membership.

The insurance program, moreover, has been the principal factor in the conservatism of the brotherhoods. Anxious to safeguard their insurance resources, the officials counseled against strikes⁹⁹, except as a last resort, and frowned upon sympathetic strikes. Because they have not demanded the exclusive employment of union men, the brotherhoods have not engaged in strikes for the closed shop⁹⁹. This policy is attributable to the fact that railway employees need not fear competition with substandard workers, since considerable skill, training and experience are required. Conciliation, mediation and voluntary arbitration⁹⁹, as provided in railway labor legislation, are preferred to strikes. Since railroading is a public-service industry, the brotherhoods enjoy a strategic position in negotiations with employers.

There have been a few departures from traditional conservatism. Following the World War, the brotherhoods, which had received favorable treatment from the United States Government during the war, sponsored the Plumb Plan⁹⁹ for government operation of the railroads. Although the plan was viewed as radical, there is reason to believe that self-interest was responsible for this sponsorship. Another departure from established policies is the venture of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers into the field of banking, beginning with the organization of the Engineers' Co-operative National Bank of Cleveland, Nov. 1, 1920.

[Helen Marot, *American Labor Unions*; E. C. Robbins, *The Railway Conductors*; United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Handbook of American Trade Unions*, Bulletin No. 618, pp. 245-277, Washington, D. C., 1936.]

GORDON S. WATKINS

Railroad Conspiracy, THE (1849-50), was against the Michigan Central Railroad^o, the first built in that state, by certain persons angered by disputes over rights of way, the location of stations, the killing of cattle by locomotives, etc. The conspirators stoned and shot at trains, destroyed culverts, removed rails and burned stations. The freight depot at Detroit was burned, and when rebuilt, burned again. Twelve participants were tried in 1851 and given prison sentences ranging from five to ten years.

[*Report of the Great Conspiracy Case: the People of the State of Michigan against Abel F. Fitch and Others.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Railroad Conventions in any particular region concerned were a phenomenon of the early years of railroad promotion. They were held before the railroads were built rather than after their completion. They were composed not only of railway builders, but also, and principally, of the public-spirited citizens of their vicinities.

The conventions served as a vent for popular enthusiasm for better means of transportation and helped to generate it. They probably did not greatly stimulate private investment in railroad securities, but they undoubtedly did yeoman service in the numerous campaigns for state or local aid. It was hoped in many cases that they would serve to reconcile conflicting interests and aspirations as to routes and termini; in the nature of things they could only demonstrate or promote popular interest in particular projects.

Railroad conventions were innumerable. Perhaps the most notable were the three great Pacific Railroad conventions in St. Louis and Memphis, October, 1849, and Philadelphia, April, 1850. They were held to demonstrate the strength of the popular demand for Federal aid for a railroad to the Pacific, to formulate a practicable plan of financing it, and to assert claims for the eastern terminus—the Philadelphia convention supported the pretensions of St. Louis. Congress gave their resolutions scant courtesy. One of the most influential gatherings of the sort ever held was the Southwestern Railroad Convention in New Orleans, January, 1852. It helped to launch Louisiana and New Orleans upon ambitious programs of state and municipal aid and to make clear the broad outlines of a proper railroad system for the whole Southwest. The Pacific Railroad Convention in Sacramento, September, 1859, and February, 1860, sought to unite the Pacific coast in support of a central route (see Union Pacific Railroad), and to persuade the legislatures of California, Oregon and Washington Territory to make provision for getting the western leg of the proposed railroad started. The

Southwestern Convention in Memphis, November, 1845, was interested primarily in the improvement of western rivers; but it also endorsed the major railroad projects of the Southwest and broached the subject of a southern route for a Pacific railroad. Similarly the Chicago Rivers and Harbors Convention, July, 1847, gave secondary concern to railroad projects for connecting the East and the West.

[F. L. Paxson, *History of the American Frontier*; R. E. Riegel, *The Story of the Western Railroads*; R. S. Cotterill, *Early Agitation for a Pacific Railroad, 1845-1850*, in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, IV; The Memphis Railroad Convention, in *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, IV; The National Railroad Convention in St. Louis, 1849, in *Missouri Historical Review*, XII; F. A. Cleveland and F. W. Powell, *Railroad Promotion and Capitalization in the United States.*]

R. R. RUSSEL

Railroad Co-Ordinator, or what was officially referred to as the Office of Federal Co-ordinator of Transportation, was provided for by Title I of the Emergency Railroad Transportation Act of June 16, 1933. Authorized by the law to function for one year, the Office was extended until June 16, 1936, by executive orders. During this period the Office was filled by Joseph B. Eastman who was partially relieved meanwhile of his duties as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission^o. One function of the Co-ordinator was to "encourage and promote or require action" by carriers which would "avoid unnecessary duplication of services and facilities of whatsoever nature and permit the joint use of terminals and trackage incident thereto or requisite to such joint use"; which would "control allowances, occasional services and the charges therefor, and other practices affecting service or operation, to the end that undue impairment of net earnings may be prevented", and which would "avoid other wastes and preventable expense." A second function was "to promote financial reorganization of the carriers" while a third was "to provide for the immediate study of other means of improving conditions surrounding transportation in all its forms and the preparation of plans therefor." The law further provided that the Co-ordinator should divide the carriers into three groups, eastern, western and southern, in each of which groups a co-ordinating committee of seven members was to be set up.

During its existence, the Office of the Co-ordinator carried on extensive investigations and prepared several detailed reports on railroad problems. Among the subjects surveyed, with the assistance of several hundred employees, were merchandise traffic, passenger traffic, car loadings, car pooling, condition of railroad equip-

ment, labor relations, and unification and co-ordination of terminal facilities and shops. Apparently investigations and reports constituted practically the whole accomplishment of the Co-ordinator.

[Statutes-at-Large, Vol. 48; Laurence F. Schmeckebier, *New Federal Organizations*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Railroad Gauges. The Stockton and Darlington, the pioneer railroad of England, was of a 4 foot, 8-inch gauge, and in 1830 Parliament fixed the legal gauge as not less than this. Several of the early railroads in America adopted these figures with half an inch added. Others, however, followed their own ideas, and tracks were of all imaginable widths, from 2 feet up to 6. The Erie, the first of the country's great railroads, adopted 6 feet. In the South, 5 feet was generally used, and Horatio Allen, the first engineer of the Delaware and Hudson, recommended this width in the North, but without effect. The Mad River and Lake Erie, the first railroad in Ohio (built 1837-38), decided upon 4 feet, 10 inches, and the Ohio legislature thereupon enacted a law that all railroads must be of that width; but this law was later repealed. The multiplicity of gauges finally became intolerable. When through trains or cars were operated, long delays were incurred at junction points while cars were lifted and the trucks changed under them. In 1886 all railroads in the nation were finally made "Standard Gauge," 4 feet, 8½ inches. In later years, executives greatly regretted that a wider track had not been adopted.

[C. F. Carter, *When Railroads Were New*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Railroad Land Grants. See Land Grants to Railways.

Railroad Mediation Acts. The authority of Congress to deal with labor disputes in the transportation industry was first asserted under the commerce clause⁹⁹ in 1898. The plan of mediation and arbitration established by this law (The Erdman Act and its successor, the Newlands Act of 1913) endured with reasonable success until 1916 when the railroad brotherhoods⁹⁹ refused to submit to mediation (see Adamson Act). A Railway Wage Board was active during the period of government operation which began in 1917 (see Railway Administration Act). The Transportation Act of 1920⁹⁹, which returned the railroads to private operation, established a Railroad Labor Board.

In 1926 Congress enacted the Railway Labor Act which abolished the board created under the

1920 law and set up a new agency known as the United States Board of Mediation. In 1934 an amendment to the 1926 law abolished the board created under that law and created a new one known as the National Mediation Board. This agency, with jurisdiction in labor disputes not only affecting interstate common carriers by rail but also affecting such carriers by air, has the following powers and duties: (1) to avoid any interruption to commerce; (2) to forbid any limitation upon freedom of association among employees; (3) to provide for independence of carriers and employees in carrying out the purposes of the act; and (4) to provide for the prompt and orderly settlement of all disputes concerning changes in rates of pay, rules or working conditions.

[J. R. Commons, et al., *History of Labor in the United States*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Railroad Rate Law. The states were the first to regulate railroad rates. In the 1870's the Middle Western states tried to aid depressed agriculture by laws to lower railroad rates. These were called Granger Laws⁹⁹, from the name of a society which was active in promoting them. These laws were upheld in *Munn v. Illinois*⁹⁹ and other cases. In 1886 in the *Wabash case*⁹⁹ (118 U. S. 557) it was held that a state could not regulate the part of an interstate rate which was within its borders even if the Federal Government had not acted. The Interstate Commerce Act of 1887⁹⁹ followed. It provided under the commerce clause⁹⁹ of the Constitution for the regulation of interstate rates. The rates must be reasonable and not discriminate between persons, places or commodities. The form of place discrimination by charging more for a short than a long haul was specifically forbidden. The execution of the law was entrusted to the Interstate Commerce Commission⁹⁹. In 1897 the Supreme Court held that the I. C. C. in its decisions could not set a maximum rate (167 U. S. 479). This power was given to the Commission by the Hepburn Act⁹⁹ of 1906. The Transportation Act⁹⁹ of 1920 gave the Commission the right to set a minimum rate.

The Shreveport case⁹⁹ (1914) held that if a state-made rate causes discrimination against an outside point, the power of Congress is supreme and the intrastate rate must be changed. This largely nullified the powers of states over rates.

The problem of discrimination has been fairly satisfactorily handled. The problem of the general level of rates has been more difficult. The statement is simple. Reasonable rates are those which give a fair return on a fair valuation of

the road. Lower rates amount to depriving the railroad of property without due process⁹⁷ of law. Higher rates injure the users of the railroad service. Much litigation has failed to make the matter of valuation definite. The Transportation Act of 1920 provided that rates by regions should be enough to yield 5½% (or another return set by the I. C. C.) on the value of the property. The Act of 1933 made the criterion the need of "adequate and efficient railway transportation service at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service . . . and the need of revenues sufficient to enable the carriers, under honest, economical and efficient management, to provide such service." This seems to be even vaguer than the old criterion.

[S. Daggett, *Principles of Inland Transportation*.]

JAMES D. MAGEE

Railroad Rate Wars. The rapid expansion of railroads following the close of the Civil War added greatly to the number of communities, large and small, served by two or more railroads for traffic between these communities and markets. The fact that many of the points served by competitive railroads were ports, intensified competition by bringing into the competitive struggle the water carriers serving the ports.

Competition led to rate cutting by the railroads and water carriers, and caused widespread use of rebates⁹⁸. Competition among railroads and between railroads and water lines, the cutting of rates and the payment of rebates were not unknown prior to this period, but heretofore they had been sporadic and intermittent; in this period they were widespread and regular, and became a public scandal.

In the competitive struggle for traffic, freight rates and passenger fares were cut by rival railroads and steamship lines between competitive points, while the rates and fares between, to or from noncompetitive points served by only one railroad or where railroad and water competition did not exist were not reduced. In other cases, rates upon the traffic of certain preferred shippers were reduced, while the rates and fares charged those whose patronage was not so ardently sought were not reduced. In other cases, rates upon certain types of traffic moving in large quantities and with regularity—desirable traffic to the hard-pressed competitors—were slashed, while rates upon traffic moving in smaller quantities and with less regularity were not reduced. These conditions resulted in widespread public complaints against the relatively high "local" or noncompetitive rates and the lower "through" or competitive rates.

Railroad competition became particularly se-

vere when, after 1869, the trunk line railroads, especially the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central⁹⁹, reached the large cities of the Middle West. Recurrent rate wars in the period following 1869 caused freight rates and passenger fares between principal competitive centers to fall to absurdly low prices, while rates to and from the less-favored points where competition was absent did not follow the same trend. The excesses of the competitive orgy resulted in sharp fluctuations in rates and in the bankruptcy of railroads. The disastrous Panic of 1873¹⁰⁰, caused in part by unbridled railroad competition and attendant fall in railroad earning capacity, did not check the rate wars. In fact, they were intensified. In 1874 the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad¹⁰¹ was extended to Chicago, and the Grand Trunk Railroad was opened to Milwaukee. The following two years witnessed one of the most disastrous railroad rate wars in history between the Baltimore and Ohio, Erie, Grand Trunk, New York Central and Pennsylvania railroads, between Middle Western points and the Atlantic seaboard. The rates between competitive points served by these railroads were demoralized and often, it has been said, were not sufficient to defray direct train operating expenses. The impaired financial position of the roads as a result of this ruthless competition led to a temporary truce and a traffic-sharing arrangement in 1877.

Competition among railroads serving the north Atlantic ports: Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore, resulted in rate wars among the railroads and between the railroads and the Erie Canal¹⁰². In like manner, competition among Southern railroads was intensified as several railroads reached inland points, such as Atlanta. Severe competition occurred between railroads and water carriers at the principal ports on the Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, Mississippi River and Ohio River. Rate wars threatened to demoralize the financial structures of rail and water carriers.

In the West rate wars resulted from the multiplication of railroads and the struggle between the railroads and steamboat lines for freight at important traffic centers such as St. Louis, Kansas City and Omaha.

The overbuilding of railroads and the unregulated competition among railroads and between railroads and water lines, accompanied by the speculative management of some of these carriers and by the inability of the railroads to temporarily suspend service until the excessive competition had abated, accounted for the severity and destructiveness of rate wars.

Another interesting commentary upon rate wars was the peculiar ability of railroads or other carriers in impaired financial condition to cause and exaggerate the effects of the rate-cutting contests. These carriers were usually bankrupt and had no interest charges to pay. They were not earning enough to pay these charges or dividends upon capital stock. Freed of the burden of these charges they were able to reduce rates in the hope of attracting traffic from their solvent rivals which were meeting interest charges and sometimes paying dividends. They had little to lose and much to gain either through increasing their traffic and gross earnings or forcing their more vulnerable competitors to yield and divide traffic or earnings.

Railroad rate wars, accompanied by unjust and unreasonable discriminations among persons, communities and kinds of traffic, led to the development of popular antagonism to railroads in the period following 1870. One result of this popular protest was the enactment by a number of states, particularly the Western granger states, of severe and often restrictive and punitive railroad regulatory legislation and the organization of state regulatory commissions (*see Granger Cases*).

Another result of rate wars and their attendant abuses was the demand for Federal railroad regulation. The Cullom Committee⁷⁰ in 1886 recommended Federal legislation to regulate railroad transportation and the formation of a Federal regulatory commission to correct the paramount evils of unjust discrimination. Congress in 1887 enacted the Act to Regulate Commerce which established the Interstate Commerce Commission⁷¹ in order to correct these evils.

[A. T. Hadley, *Railroad Transportation*; E. R. Johnson, *American Railway Transportation*; L. G. McPherson, *Railroad Freight Rates*; *Report of the Senate Select Committee on Interstate Commerce*, The Cullom Report, 49th Congress, 1st Session; W. Z. Ripley, *Railroads: Rates and Regulation*.]

G. LLOYD WILSON

Railroad Rebates. *See* Rebates.

Railroad Retirement Acts. A Railroad Retirement Act was approved by President F. D. Roosevelt, June 27, 1934, with the comment that it was "crudely drawn" and would require revision. Under the act retirement allowances were provided for certain categories of employees, two thirds of the cost to be borne by employers and the balance by the employees. A Federal Board of three members was created to administer the system. No adequate actuarial studies had been made and it was freely predicted that benefit payments would soon exhaust available

funds, while the carriers claimed that their share would prove a crushing load on the finances of most railroads. In March, 1935, the Supreme Court, in *Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton Railroad Co.*,⁷² declared the act unconstitutional. New legislation was promptly introduced and two bills were passed the following August, the first providing a retirement plan and the second imposing special taxes for its support. These acts retained several features which the Supreme Court had found objectionable in the earlier enactment and the railroads renewed the contest on its constitutionality in the court of the District of Columbia which issued an injunction against its enforcement, June 30, 1936. Efforts to find a satisfactory solution by conference of railroad managements and the employee organizations were now begun. In May, 1937, new legislation approved by both parties was introduced in Congress and carried with little opposition a month later. Sen. Clark (Mo.) declared, on passage of the bill, that "it was the most hopeful thing that has happened in the United States in a great many years with regard to the relationship between employer and employee."

[*The Railway Age*, Vol. 98-103.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Railroad Retirement Board v. Alton Railroad Co. In this decision (295 U. S. 330, 1935) the Supreme Court, dividing five to four, invalidated the Railroad Pension Act of 1934. The majority opinion declared the act contrary to the due process clause⁷³ of the Fifth Amendment because of a long series of arbitrary impositions on the carriers and, furthermore, because "the pension plan thus imposed is in no proper sense a regulation of the activity of interstate transportation." The minority opinion, while agreeing that the retroactive feature of the law violated the Fifth Amendment, declared that the establishment of a pension system was entirely within the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce⁷⁴.

W. A. ROBINSON

Railroad Strike of 1877, THE. During 1877 the current depression of that decade reached its lowest point, marked by repeated wage reductions, particularly among the railroads. Militant feeling among trainmen expressed itself in spontaneous outbreaks. On July 17, 1877, after a new 10% wage reduction went into effect, trainmen halted freight cars of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad⁷⁵ at Martinsburg, W. Va. When the local militia proved sympathetic, President Hayes, upon request of the governor, sent Gen. Hancock and 200 Federal soldiers to the scene and

the strike ended there, but not until it had begun spreading over the nation. At Baltimore, a mob surrounded the state armory, fought with the soldiers, and attempted unsuccessfully to burn the building. At Pittsburgh, where popular feeling was strongly against the railroads, militia ordered from Philadelphia was besieged in a roundhouse and narrowly escaped the flames of a fire begun at the shops. Sympathetic strikes in other cities brought further news of rioting. A wave of reaction followed as courts and legislators revived the obsolete doctrines of conspiracy. The precedent of Federal troops in industrial disputes became an active one and the states strengthened their policing activities. Radical labor parties found expression in a new rift between classes.

[Samuel Yellen, *American Labor Struggles*.]

HARVEY WISH

Railroad Strikes of 1886, THE. During 1884-85, the Knights of Labor[™] succeeded in winning four of the five major railroad strikes. Although Jay Gould, whose railway system had fought the Knights, expressly agreed to show no antiunion discrimination, he secretly prepared to break the power of the order. The latter, encouraged by its victories, pressed for full observance of the agreement, and when the Texas and Pacific Railroad[™] office at Marshall, Texas, discharged its union foreman, a general strike was ordered for March 1, 1886, on the issue of union recognition and a daily wage of \$1.50 for the unskilled. Under the leadership of Martin Irons, 900 men struck, tying up 5000 miles of railway in the Central States, and the struggle soon took on the aspect of a crusade against capital. Gould would neither arbitrate unless the workers first returned to work nor would he reinstate discharged strikers. After two months, marked by occasional violence and the employment of Federal troops, the strike collapsed on May 3. This defeat discredited industrial unionism and its proponent, the Knights of Labor, assuring the subsequent victory of the craft unions as exemplified by the American Federation of Labor[™].

[J. R. Commons et al., *History of Labor in the United States*, Vol. II.]

HARVEY WISH

Railroad Surveys, Early Government. Interest in a railroad to the Pacific, already aroused by the writings and activities of John Plumbé, Asa Whitney and others, became keen and widespread after the territorial expansion resulting from the Mexican Cession[™] of 1848. The question of the best route now became the subject of a great deal of discussion, especially since each

state along the Mississippi and each Mid-Western city of any size from the Canadian border to the Gulf evinced a direct and active interest in the selection.

In 1853, therefore, Congress added the sum of \$150,000 to the army appropriation bill to defray the expenses of surveying feasible routes to the Pacific. Under the direction of Jefferson Davis, Secretary of War, parties were sent into the field and five routes were surveyed. The northernmost survey, between the forty-seventh and forty-ninth parallels from St. Paul to the mouth of the Columbia, received widespread publicity because of the enthusiasm of the leader, Gov. Isaac I. Stevens[™] of the New Territory of Washington. Data regarding a route in general along the emigrant trail to California was secured by a party under Lt. E. G. Beckwith. A difficult route between the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth parallels was surveyed by Capt. J. W. Gunnison[™], who was killed during an Indian ambush. A survey following the thirty-fifth parallel as closely as possible from Fort Smith to Los Angeles was conducted by Lt. A. W. Whipple. Finally parties under Capt. John Pope, Lt. J. G. Parke and others explored a far southern route along the thirty-second parallel.

The reports of these surveys, later published in copiously illustrated volumes, contributed greatly to geographical and scientific knowledge concerning the Far West. The surveys, however, did not bring agreement as to a route. Jefferson Davis championed the southernmost survey (*see* Gadsden Purchase), but sectional rivalry was too great to permit the choice of a route until after the Southern states had seceded from the Union, when the Pacific Railroad Bill was adopted in 1862 (*see* Union Pacific Railroad).

[George L. Albright, *Official Explorations for a Pacific Railroad*; E. Douglas Branch, *Westward: The Romance of the American Frontier*.]

DAN E. CLARK

Railroad Track, The Wrong Side of. The phrase, "the wrong side of the railroad track," entered the American vocabulary from the fact that in the industrial centers of the Northeast there tended to be a natural cleavage between families living on one side of the railroad tracks and those on the other. The workers in the mills, living near their places of employment, were separated from those economically more fortunate, who had their homes on the other side. In the life of the community the distinction between the two was generally recognized and lines were drawn, even in the schools and the churches. The demarcation was, as a rule, supported by the natural impulses of both

groups. For example, Robert A. Woods once reported that a great number of the adults and children living in the neighborhood of the South End House never crossed the railroad tracks and knew nothing of the Back Bay section of Boston.

Children, and especially youth, are most likely to protest against any social liability coming from their living on the wrong side of the tracks. Those who are strong enough to break through and, in spite of handicap, become successful, find their earlier disadvantages an asset, since they then gain the popular recognition that Americans delight to give the self-made. This is especially true in politics. In society in the narrower sense, however, having been born on the wrong side of the track continues to be a drawback.

ERNEST R. GROVES

Railroads. It is thought that an inclined tramway with wooden rails, running down a slope from a brick kiln in Boston, and built about 1795, was the first primitive railway in America. At least half a dozen other tramways were built between 1809 and 1825, operated variously by cable, gravity and horsepower. The first to use iron rails was one of about three miles length, running from a quarry to Neponset, Mass., built in 1826. Oliver Evans of Philadelphia offered in 1786 to operate steam carriages on the highways, but could induce no one to listen to him. John Stevens of Hoboken suggested in 1811 the building of a railway with steam engines, this three years before Stephenson tested his first locomotive in England. Stevens obtained a charter in 1815 for a railroad, but could not procure the necessary funds. He tried to obtain government support, but in vain. In 1820 he built on his estate in Hoboken a narrow-gauge railway and small locomotive, undoubtedly the first to operate in America. In 1823 Pennsylvania authorized him to build a railroad from Philadelphia to Columbia, but again it was impossible to finance the undertaking. In 1826 William Strickland, who had been sent to England by the State of Pennsylvania to study the subject, published a book advocating railways and telling of their success in England, and this so altered public opinion that two projects were soon financed—the Baltimore & Ohio, and the Charleston & Hamburg^{aw} in South Carolina—and construction began upon them in 1828. On the B. & O. the cars were at first pulled by horses, and on both, the experiment of operating cars by sails was tried (*see Aeolus*). In 1829 the first practical steam locomotives, two in number, were brought from England by the Delaware & Hudson Canal Company^{aw}, one of them being the Stourbridge

Lion^{aw}. In 1830 steam engines made in New York were installed on both the B. & O. and the C. & H. The Mohawk & Hudson Railroad^{aw} was built from Albany to Schenectady in 1830–31, and in 1832 the first cars of the New York & Harlem began running on the Bowery^{aw} in New York City. They were drawn by horses, and were, in effect, street cars, the road then being only a few blocks in length. It did not introduce locomotives until 1837; the line, extended much farther than Harlem, finally became an important link in the New York Central^{aw} system. In 1832 the Philadelphia, Germantown & Norristown had six miles of track in operation, and the Camden & Amboy, fourteen miles in New Jersey.

The first two great locomotive builders, Matthias Baldwin of Philadelphia and Thomas Rogers of Paterson, N. J., were producing by 1832, but for several years their output was comparatively small. Most railroads began with horse-drawn cars, and as there was no system of despatching, great was the annoyance when two drivers going in opposite directions met on the single track between the infrequent turnouts or switches. The 81-mile railroad between Philadelphia and Columbia, Pa., finally built as a part of the Pennsylvania Canal System^{aw}, was, while in slow process of construction from 1829 to 1834, considered (being state property) as a public highway, on which any person or company might place a car and team and operate at will. The resulting confusion on a single-track line may be faintly imagined. The state finally installed locomotives upon the full completion of the line and withdrew the privilege of public occupancy. The earliest passenger cars on the railroads were merely stagecoach bodies on flanged wheels. They rapidly grew in size and soon assumed a boxlike shape. The T-shaped rail designed by John Stevens' son Robert was, by 1833, rapidly displacing the old strap-iron rail fastened to a wooden stringer. Tracks were still flimsy, however; washouts frequently occurred; or the tracks were covered with earth in cuttings. Derailings, upsets and collisions were numerous, but as speed was never more than twenty or twenty-five miles per hour, the accidents that occurred would not appear serious to a later era, though they were regarded with horror at the time. For the first few years, trains ran only by daylight, but the demand for speed forced the development of the locomotive headlight, and then of crude sleeping cars in 1838.

In 1831 construction on the first New England railroad, the Boston & Lowell, was begun, and in the following year the Boston & Provi-

dence and Boston and Worcester were under way, all three being completed in 1834-35. Frankfort and Lexington, Ky., began a connecting line in 1834. These were typical of the early railroad projects—short lines between two neighboring cities, among whose bankers and businessmen all the promoting was done and stock sold. Within a few years those cities would be connected with others not far off by other small railroads, all owned by separate corporations. The traveler going a considerable distance must buy a new ticket and have his baggage rechecked every forty, fifty or seventy-five miles, and wait for hours, sometimes overnight, at junction points; but even so, the system was regarded as a wonderful convenience. A through ticket from New York to Buffalo—using Hudson River steamboat to Albany, railroad from Albany to Schenectady, and Erie Canal[™] packet thence to Buffalo—was issued as early as 1831, but apparently it was not copied elsewhere. In 1840, when one might journey from Philadelphia to Charleston, S. C., 680 miles, with seven changes of cars in sixty hours, this was advertised as a marvel of speed and convenience. The first long-distance project was that of the New York & Erie (*see* Erie Railroad).

Before 1840 it was evident to many observers that the canals[™], upon which so much time and money had been spent, were doomed by the competition of the rails. The Pennsylvania Railroad[™], for example, chartered in 1846, built its Philadelphia-Pittsburgh line largely alongside the state's main canal, which was the beginning of the end of the latter. Railroad building was soon overdone, and in some states, especially in the Mid-West and South, lines were created which showed only deficits. Some charters granted and some construction begun in 1834-36 were halted by the panic of 1837[™] and held in suspension for several years. Some unfinished projects were wholly abandoned; others were not resuscitated until from five to ten years after the panic. The young Mid-Western states, Indiana and Illinois, had planned state railroads, and Indiana had even begun building one. Illinois planned nine railroads, of 1300 miles aggregate length, only a fraction of which was built. Michigan took over two roads, private enterprises whose construction had stopped because of the depression, but after toiling with them until 1844, the state sold them at a heavy loss to Eastern capitalists. By 1845 rail-laying was again well under way. Speed was now rapidly increasing. By 1848 Baldwin and Rogers were building locomotives which could run a mile in a minute, but no existing track or cars were safe for such

a speed. Such power was a great temptation, however; schedules were quickened, speeds continued to rise, and an era of disasters, with much loss of life, came on; collisions, derailings, broken or burned bridges—for bridges[™] were mostly of wood—caused loud demands by editors and publicists for more care and better construction. Although Morse's telegraph[™] had been patented in 1844, it was not until 1851 that a superintendent on the New York & Erie thought of using it to regulate trains and their meeting places, and even then, the idea was not taken up by other railroads in general for years afterward. In fact, as late as 1875 there were still some railroads in the West and South operating without telegraphs. The first really successful coal-burning locomotive was produced in 1855, though most locomotives continued to burn wood for years thereafter; and the first Pullman cars[™] were put into service in 1858.

In the Middle West, the vast unpopulated spaces made railroad operation as yet a business of little profit; and the subsidizing of new projects by the granting of large areas of public land (*see* Land Grants to Railways) began in 1851 with such aid given by Congress to the Illinois Central[™], which was to build from Chicago to Cairo, Ill. At that, new promotions sprang into being all over the Middle West, and old ones took on new life. From Chicago, within that decade, not only the Illinois Central, but the Chicago & Alton to the southward, and to the westward and northwestward the Chicago & Rock Island, the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, the Chicago & North Western and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul[™] reached the Mississippi and some even crossed it. By 1860 Illinois, with less than half the population of New York, had 2799 miles of railroad to New York's 2682; while Ohio, with two thirds of New York's population, had 2946 miles. The general trend of most of the new roads was westward, but the Illinois Central pushed beyond the Ohio toward New Orleans, while another great system, the Louisville & Nashville[™], was launched in Kentucky and Tennessee. St. Louis was reached by the Ohio & Mississippi in 1857, but even before that the Missouri Pacific[™] had begun its thrust westward from St. Louis. The Panic of 1857[™] again slowed up railroad building, and the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 put a stop to it for several years. The rails proved of enormous value to both sides during the war for the movement of troops, munitions and supplies, as was proven by the fact that no small part of the time of both armies was employed in burning bridges and totally destroying rail lines which could be

of use to the enemy, and, adversely, in restoring them in jerry-built fashion (*see* Railroads, Influence of, in Civil War). The rail and economic systems of the South were so completely wrecked by the war that two or three decades passed before the railroads in general were restored to a reasonably high degree of efficiency.

A railroad across the Rocky Mountains, the Union Pacific^{er}, long contemplated, was begun in 1864, and with the coming of the period of inflated prosperity following the war, a railroad building mania seized the country, especially in the Mississippi Valley and the prairie states; so that within a decade or so, the nation's map was crisscrossed by the greatest web of rails anywhere on the globe. Many lines were far ahead of their time, many were unnecessary parallels of others. There was a race of westbound lines toward the Missouri River. The Kansas Pacific^{er} was paralleling the Union Pacific toward Denver; the Southern Pacific^{er} was building through the southern tier of states; the Northern Pacific^{er} through the northern tier. Huge government land grants were going to the promoters; and counties along the rights of way—sometimes as an inducement to lure a projected line through their boundaries—were bonding themselves in large sums and turning the bonds over to promoters in exchange for stock in the railroad companies. Even after this was done, the road was in some cases not built; for there was much chicanery and some appalling recklessness during this period. There was also a vast increase in stockjobbing, and much combination and absorption of smaller roads. Cornelius Vanderbilt had by 1869 combined all the small lines between New York, Albany and Buffalo into the New York Central, and become the most powerful figure in American railroading. His battles with Gould and Fisk over the Erie, the trickery practised in that and other embroglios, the *Crédit Mobilier* scandal, the Panic of 1873, with the crash of Jay Cooke & Company and their Northern Pacific project, the resulting enormous losses in railway stocks and bonds, all these brought the business into disrepute^{er}. The cry of "monopoly" was raised, and the Grange movement^{er} became in the 1870's the avowed enemy of railroads. The manipulation of great promoters in the years that followed, the oppression of shippers in the matter of freight rates and otherwise, intensified the enmity. In 1877 the first great railroad strike (*see* Railroad Strike of 1877) occurred, with much violence and destruction of property. Finally in 1887, after twenty years of increasing pressure, Congress created the Interstate Commerce Commis-

sion^{er}, and its repeated strengthening in the years that followed curbed railroad power more and more. Meanwhile, strikes, with consequent increases in wages and shortening of hours, all culminating in the Adamson Act^{er}, greatly reduced railroad profits. At the same time many and enormous improvements had been made in roadbed and equipment; many tracks had been doubled; some even quadrupled; and higher speeds prevailed, with a steady decrease in serious accidents.

At the close of the 19th century came the notable rise of Edward H. Harriman, whose expressed ambition it was to dominate the entire railroad system of the country. He rapidly obtained control of the Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, Illinois Central, Oregon Short Line and Chicago & Alton and extended his influence into other companies. His effort to wrest control of the C. B. & Q. and Northern Pacific from James J. Hill precipitated a small panic in Wall Street in 1901 (*see* Northern Securities Case). At his death in 1909 he controlled 25,000 miles of railways and had a more or less dominant interest in 50,000 more, not to mention shipping and other vast interests. After 1910 the competition of the automobile^{er}, and a little later of the motor truck^{er}, began to be felt by the railroads. The World War came on with these problems troubling them. Already, by congressional act of Aug. 29, 1916, the President had been authorized to take over the railway system of the country in time of war and use it, to the exclusion, as far as might be necessary, of other traffic. In 1917, therefore, the Government seized the railroads, and William G. McAdoo became their Director General—to be succeeded later by Walker D. Hines (*see* Railroad Administration). During the first year of government operation, the net loss was more than \$212,000,000, and during the second year about \$650,000,000—this not counting money spent in replacements of equipment.

When the roads were returned to private ownership on March 1, 1920, they were in a badly run-down condition, and failed to recover their prosperity. The cross-country motor bus then came to add its competition at lower rates. Soon single cars operated by gasoline motors began displacing local trains on some less important runs. To recover their passenger traffic the railroads first provided finer day coaches, then more comfortable Pullmans. By order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a two-cents-per-mile fare was adopted by Eastern roads in 1936. Then came the streamlined train^{er}, with luxurious appointments, drawn either by a Diesel or

a faster steam locomotive. The twenty-hour time between New York and Chicago was cut first to seventeen, and then in 1938 to sixteen hours. Nevertheless, the abandonment of branch lines, then of small independent railroads, then of longer ones, which had begun soon after the financial crash of 1929, grew apace. Motor competition became so strong that at one sweep in the summer of 1938 more than eighty trains were withdrawn from the Cape Cod sector of the New Haven Railroad, passenger service on the farther portion being entirely abandoned. In that year about one third of the mileage of the country's greatest railroads was in the hands of the courts

[Slason Thompson, *A Short History of American Railways*; Seymour Dunbar, *A History of Travel in America*; Agnes C. Laut, *The Romance of the Rails*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Railroads, Association of American, THE, was formed in November, 1934, as a consolidation of the old American Railway Association[™], the Association of Railway Executives and other railroad associations and organizations. Its members are the railroads themselves. The officers and employees of the railroads participate in the technical and public-relations work of numerous divisions, sections, bureaus and committees.

HARVEY WALKER

Railroads, Influence of, in Civil War. The Civil War was the first great armed conflict in which railroads were an important factor. Because of its nature and the vast area of operations, railroad transportation was essential. The line of separation between the rival forces was fully 2000 miles long, great portions of the region were thinly settled and in many localities it was difficult for large bodies of troops to live off the country, supplies and munitions frequently had to be transported long distances; it was often necessary or advisable to transfer troops from one area to another (*see* Chattanooga Campaign).

Northern railroad building westward into the Ohio and Mississippi valleys had insured the adherence of these sections to the Federal Union. Southern construction was mainly east and west between the Atlantic seaboard and the Mississippi, and from Richmond to the Carolinas and Georgia, though, in 1861, lines connecting the Lower South and the Tennessee River Valley to the Ohio at Louisville and Cincinnati were projected or under way. For military purposes perhaps the most important lines were those from the Gulf states to Richmond via Chattanooga enabling shipment of supplies and munitions to

Virginia and the transfer of troops on interior lines (*see* Chickamauga, Battle of).

The North, bent on invasion and conquest of the seceded states, necessarily took the offensive; the South stood mostly on the defensive. As early as March 31, 1861, the Union Government began to use important strategic roads and on Jan. 31, 1862, the President was authorized "to take possession of [certain] railroad and telegraph lines." On Feb. 11, 1862, a Military Director and Superintendent of Railroads was appointed. The Confederate government, from necessity becoming more federalistic as the war progressed, was restricted to "supervision and control." Though government work practically monopolized the transportation system of the Confederacy, it was not until February, 1865, that authorization was given to take over the Southern railroads. Of a total mileage of 31,256 in the United States in 1861, less than 30%, or 9283 miles, was in the Confederate states and this was soon reduced by Union captures to about 6000 miles. In general the Northern railroads were better built, better equipped and better run. There were no Southern trunk lines, most of the railroads being essentially local in character and purpose. Intercommunication with other lines was by transfer, both because of lack of physical connection and differences in track gauge. Southern roads were also handicapped by disrepair, inferior track and roadbed, worn-out rolling stock and bridges that could neither be replaced nor properly repaired, all of which resulted in long delays, frequent accidents and limited traffic. In the North, the east-west lines constantly transported men and supplies to the Virginia battlefield. Reinforcements to the Tennessee Valley and Gulf states came down the Ohio and Mississippi to western terminals at Memphis, St. Louis and Vicksburg, to be transported eastward.

Inability of the Confederate government, at first, to appreciate the proper use of railroads and later states' rights[™] opposition to government control and operation of the roads as an auxiliary to Southern defense, were, in no small measure, responsible for the final collapse of the Confederacy. The superior Northern roads, both as to condition and location, prompt Federal control where necessary, and greater means, made of them an effective military auxiliary.

[*American Historical Review*, Vol. 22; Edward Channing, *History of the United States*, Vol. VI; J. C. Schwab, *The Confederate States of America*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Rails. The first railroads in the United States were short tramways built to haul heavy materials in and from quarries and mines, the motive

410 Railway Administration Act

power usually being horse, mule or gravity. The earliest steam railroads used wooden rails with flat strips of bar iron secured to their upper surface. Owing to their lightness and especially to the danger of the "strap" rails becoming loose and causing accidents, heavy rolled iron rails were imported from England. Until 1844 all the rails used in the United States except most of the "strap" rails and a small amount of cast-iron rails were imported. The rolling of heavy iron rails in this country was begun in 1844 at the Mount Savage Rolling Mill in Maryland. Rails of the inverted U, or Evans type, and of the T type, designed by R. L. Stevens, an American, were manufactured. Other rolling mills began producing heavy rails, but much railroad iron was secured abroad.

A few imported steel rails were laid in 1864, but the manufacture of Bessemer steel rails did not begin in the United States until 1867 (*see* Iron and Steel Industry). The greater uniformity, strength and hardness of these rails gave them such excellent wearing qualities that the amount of iron rails produced after 1883 was relatively small. By 1912 the manufacture of open-hearth steel rails had surpassed Bessemer rails. During recent years rails have been made of greater and greater strength and hardness to keep pace with the increasing weight, speed and frequency of railroad trains.

[G. P. Raidabaugh, Origin and Development of the Railway Rail in England and America, in *Journal of the Iron and Steel Institute*, Vol. 95; James M. Swank, *History of the Manufacture of Iron in All Ages*.]

ARTHUR C. BINING

Railway Administration Act, THE. *See* Railroad Administration.

Railway Labor Acts (1926-34). *See* Railroad Mediation Acts.

Railway Shopmen's Strike of 1922. The Railway Employees Department of the A. F. of L.,²⁰ representing 400,000 members, struck July 1, protesting the unfavorable decisions of the Federal Labor Board (*see* Railroad Mediation Acts) and the unpunished violations of the Transportation Act²⁰ by the carriers. Faced with the most extensive railroad strike in American history, President Harding issued a warning against interference with the mails and attempted unsuccessfully to mediate the strike. Attorney General Daugherty gave powerful aid to the carriers by obtaining an exceptionally sweeping injunction against the strikers. Finally, by the Baltimore Agreement on Oct. 27, a settlement was effected large-

Rain Making on the Plains

ly in favor of the carriers, although both sides claimed victory.

[Margaret Gadsby, Strike of the Railroad Shopmen, in *Monthly Labor Review*, XV.]

HARVEY WISH

Railways, Electric. Thomas Davenport of Vermont in 1835 and Robert Davidson of Scotland in 1838 devised electrically propelled cars, both using current from voltaic batteries on the car. Other models were produced in England in 1840 and in America in 1851. Siemens and Halske's third-rail electric railway was shown in Berlin in 1879. Stephen D. Field and Thomas A. Edison exhibited an electric locomotive in Chicago in 1883, and Charles J. Van Depoele demonstrated a car taking power from a wire laid in a trough. Short electric street railways were built in Providence and Kansas City in 1884. Frank J. Sprague brought electric street transportation to practicability when he installed the trolley-car system of Richmond, Va., in 1888, now recognized as a pioneer in commercial electric traction. By 1890 there were 1200 miles of electric street railway in the United States and by 1895 10,863 miles. In 1896-97 Chicago elevated lines began to be electrically operated, followed in 1901 by those of New York and Boston. In 1895 a railroad tunnel under Baltimore was given electric traction, and other railroads presently began using electricity for tunnels and short distances. The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul's²⁰ 645-mile electrification through the Western mountains (constructed 1914-18) was an epochal achievement in this category.

[Edwin J. Houston and A. E. Kennelly, *Electric Street Railways*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Rain Making on the Great Plains was an effort to supplement the natural rainfall which was often deficient. The need was so acute and persistent that various methods, some possessing a smattering of scientific value, and others offered by quack "rain-makers," have been given frequent and hopeful trials but without success. Conspicuous among the first was the tree-planting plan on the principle that trees would serve as windbreaks and retard evaporation on the leeward side. Others suggested forming ponds to increase humidity. High explosives were given a trial by the Department of Agriculture, but though a little rain fell on the occasion of both official trials it was not deemed sufficient to justify the effort and expense. Officials of trans-plains railroads who stood to gain by success have been frequent dupes of quacks. Prayer has been, and is being, offered both in local communities and, in times of great need, in statewide efforts to

secure Divine mercy. Frequently such prayers are offered simultaneously in a concerted effort to placate Providence. In the drier states camp meetings and revivals⁹⁹ are held in summer time when drought is most threatening.

[W. P. Webb, *The Great Plains*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Raines Law, THE, a New York State liquor tax law of 1896, devised by John Raines (1840-1909), Republican state senator, prohibited Sunday and all-night sales by the retail liquor trade, but exempted hotels, with the result that the number of hotels in the state increased rapidly, especially in New York City, where many minor hostleries became resorts of prostitution, known as "Raines Law hotels."

[J. P. Peters, *The Story of the Committee of Fourteen of New York*, in *Social Hygiene*, July, 1918.]

STANLEY R. PILLSBURY

Rainfall in the United States. With regard to moisture conditions favorable to agriculture, the United States is very fortunate in comparison with most other countries of the world. The vast expanse of comparatively level and fertile country, extending from the Great Plains on the west to the Atlantic Ocean on the east and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, receives, as a rule, adequate rainfall, and temperatures are mostly favorable for crop growth. There are, however, large areas in the western half of the country which, because of scanty moisture, are unsuited for intensive crop growth unless irrigated.

On the basis of effective rainfall, the United States may be divided into an eastern and a western part, the dividing line roughly coinciding with the 100th meridian, in the vicinity of which the annual rainfall is about twenty inches. In general, east of this line moisture normally is sufficient for crop production by ordinary methods, but in large areas of the West it is deficient, and the land is primarily best suited for grazing purposes rather than for growing crops. Variations in rainfall from year to year are important. In general, there is less than the normal amount in slightly more than half the years, with a well-recognized tendency for several successive years of comparatively heavy rains to be followed by a group of years with deficient moisture.

Weather is the farmers' working partner, so to speak, and the most important phase of weather in its relation to agriculture is the occurrence of droughts⁹⁹. Droughts in the United States fall into two general classes, one of a transitory nature, affecting, usually, a comparatively small area or lasting, perhaps, for a single season, to be followed quickly by sufficient rainfall for current needs. In the other and more important

class there is a tendency to long-time deficiencies in rainfall, covering several years, such as experienced during the decade up through 1936. Transitory droughts may be expected every year in some parts of the country, but "families" of droughts, where there is a tendency to dryness over a long period of time, are of infrequent occurrence.

A few rainfall records are available for the United States for more than 100 years. These show that about a century ago there was an extended drought in the Midwestern area, culminating in the 1840's, after which there was more abundant precipitation, reaching a maximum phase in the 1870's and 1880's. Again, in the period between 1886 and 1895 an extensive drought prevailed, somewhat comparable to the series of the 1930's, and following that period of deficient moisture came again a series of years with rainfall comparatively abundant. Not every year, of course, was wet. There were a number of short droughts, but the general tendency was to sufficient rainfall. For the interior agricultural sections 1915 was the wettest year of the present century, and 1934 and 1936 the driest.

Another dry phase began about 1930 and continued, with few interspersions of fairly good years, such as 1935, up through the summer of 1936. Within this period there were three extremely dry years—1930, 1934 and 1936, the first being most pronounced in the central-eastern portion of the country and the other two affecting most extensively the interior valleys and Great Plains.

Between the 1886-95 extended drought and that of the 1930's there were several very dry summers (the most important season of the year in relation to crop production), in the principal agricultural sections. These include 1901, 1910, 1913 and 1918, but the droughts were more or less transitory. In the more important food- and feed-producing areas the five outstanding wet summers have been, in the order of wetness, 1915, 1928, 1902, 1905 and 1907. The importance of rainfall to agriculture is shown by the fact that corn yields for the entire United States averaged 23% greater for the fourteen wettest summers since 1885 than for the fourteen driest for the eleven principal corn-belt states alone. This difference of 5.3 bushels per acre on a normal acreage makes a difference for the United States of nearly 500,000,000 bushels of corn a year in favor of the wet years.

Dust storms⁹⁹ are due primarily to droughty conditions, and they are of little concern during the relatively wet phases of climate. However, it is a tragic fact that the drier sections of the

Great Plains have been extensively plowed and cultivated where crop farming never should have been attempted. Man is not responsible for drought, or dust, as sent by Nature, but he has made the results of drought more devastating to human homes and fortunes by removing from areas not climatically suited for permanent cultivation the vegetative protection, or covering, that Nature provided. Much of this one-time grassland is now under cultivation and has become an aggravator of dust storms. The basic remedy, of course, is rain. Man cannot make it rain, but he can do the next best thing—restore the original natural conditions as far as possible, and avoid repeating mistakes of the past.

In discussing drought we speak glibly of certain deficiencies in rainfall, with reference to the normal, but seldom do we grasp the enormous quantities of water represented in such shortages, which should be a matter for study to all who contend that man can make it rain, or who advocate certain practices, such as constructing ponds, to change natural climatic conditions. One inch of rainfall represents for an acre of land 113 tons of water. Ohio in 1934 had only about 70% of normal rainfall. That means that the state, based on the normal rainfall, was short of moisture some 1270 tons of water for each acre of land, on the average, or a state total of some 33,000,000,000 tons. The state had in rainfall for each acre of land within its borders about 2000 more tons of water in 1937 than in 1934. When we consider the enormous amount of energy that is required to extract this much additional water from the air for a single state for one year, it is difficult to understand how any one could seriously consider the proposition of man-made changes in climate.

[*Atlas of American Agriculture*, Part II, Section A, Precipitation and Humidity, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; *Is Our Climate Changing?*, Bulletin Illinois Farmers' Institute, 1937-38, Springfield, Ill.]

J. B. KINCER

Raisin River Massacre, THE (Jan. 22, 1813). Following Gen. Hull's surrender of Detroit⁹⁷ and Michigan in August, 1812, the Americans raised two new armies to recover these places. Late December found Gen. Winchester encamped at Maumee Rapids (above Toledo), facing the British Gen. Procter at Amherstburg. On Jan. 14, 1813, Winchester sent 650 Kentuckians to recover Frenchtown (modern Monroe) from a British-Indian force, and shortly afterward himself led 300 more to the support of his force. Procter advanced from Amherstburg and at dawn, Jan. 22, assailed the American army. Winchester was captured and one wing of the

Raleigh Tavern

army cut to pieces, whereupon the other surrendered under promise of protection from Procter's Indian allies. This pledge was disregarded and a frightful massacre followed. The affair stirred American opinion deeply and "Remember the River Raisin" became a rallying-cry throughout the war. A capable British official, castigating Procter's conduct, wrote: "within my hearing protection was promised for those poor people, be assured we have not heard the last of this shameful transaction. I wish to God it could be contradicted." His words were prophetic; a century and a quarter has not sufficed to erase the blood which stains the fame of Gen. Procter or to cover with the mantle of forgetfulness the horror he permitted.

[A. C. Casselman, ed., *Richardson's War of 1812; Burton Historical Records*, Vol. II; Silas Farmer, *History of Detroit*.]

M. M. QUAIFFÉ

Raleigh Conference of Southern Governors, THE (Oct. 13, 1856), was called by Gov. Wise of Virginia to formulate a policy in case of Frémont's election (*see* Campaign of 1856). Only the governors of Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina attended, and they were unable to adopt a program. Despite the ridicule heaped on Wise for the failure, the scare possibly influenced the North to defeat Frémont.

[B. H. Wise, *The Life of Henry A. Wise*; R. D. W. Connor, *North Carolina, Rebuilding an Ancient Commonwealth*, Vol. II.]

HENRY T. SHANKS

"Raleigh Letter," THE (April 17, 1844), was written by Henry Clay, presidential candidate of the Whigs (*see* Campaign of 1844), to explain his position on the proposed annexation of Texas⁹⁸. Since this letter indicated Clay's opposition to annexation, condemning it as both inexpedient and dishonorable, it displeased many Southern voters and contributed to his defeat.

[Carl Schurz, *Life of Henry Clay*, Vol. II.]

RICHARD E. YATES

Raleigh Tavern, THE (Williamsburg, Va.), existed as early as 1742. Twice—in 1768 and 1774—the house of burgesses, dissolved by the governor, met in rebellious session at this hostelry. Washington and Jefferson frequently stopped there. Tradition has it that Phi Beta Kappa was organized there in 1776; certainly the annual meetings of the fraternity from 1777 to 1781 were held there. In 1854 the building became a young ladies' seminary, and in 1859 it was destroyed by fire. The present building came into being as part of the Williamsburg restoration⁹⁹.

[Lyon Gardner Tyler, *Williamsburg, the Old Colonial Capital*; J. Luther Kibler, *The Cradle of the Nation*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Raleigh's Lost Colony. The group usually designated as the Lost Colony sailed from Plymouth in three small ships May 8, 1587, and reached Roanoke Island in the Albemarle region of the present North Carolina July 22, 1587. The region was then vaguely known as Virginia. The colony as listed in White's account consisted of 91 men, 17 women and 9 children, or 117 persons. Raleigh named Capt. John White governor of the colony, which was incorporated as "the Governour and Assistants of the Citie of Raleigh in Virginia."

The colonists had not meant to stop permanently on Roanoke Island, which was not believed adapted to colonization, but were instructed by Raleigh to pick up fifteen men left by Sir Richard Grenville (*see* Raleigh's Patent and First Colony), and to proceed on to the Chesapeake region. They were balked in this plan by the pilot of the expedition, who set them ashore on the island, where they occupied the houses and fort abandoned the previous year by Lane's unsuccessful colony.

From the first the Roanoke colonists, inheriting the enmity Lane had provoked, encountered the hostility of the Indians on the mainland opposite the island, although they enjoyed the friendship of Manteo and his kinsmen from the island of Croatoan to the southward. On Aug. 18 Eleanor White Dare, daughter of Gov. White and wife of Ananias Dare, gave birth to a daughter, the first English child born in America. The child was christened Virginia. Soon thereafter controversy arose as to who should go back to England for supplies. It was decided that Gov. White should return, and on Aug. 25 he sailed.

When White reached England the danger of the threatened Spanish Armada overshadowed all else. White was not able to come back to Roanoke Island until August, 1591. He discovered no trace of the colony except the letters C R O carved upon a tree, and the word CROATOAN graven on a doorpost of the palisade.

The fate of Raleigh's colony remains a mystery. It has usually been assumed that they went to the friendly Croatoans. Some have thought that they were victims of the Spanish. A stone recently discovered in Chowan County, N. C., which purports to bear a message from Eleanor White Dare to her father, would indicate that they followed Albemarle Sound up the Chowan River, suffered sickness and war, and of the twenty-four survivors in 1591, all but seven were massacred by the Indians (*see* "Dare Stone"). It is presumed these seven were absorbed by the Indians.

[Henry S. Burrage, ed., *Early English and French Voyages*.]

HAYWOOD J. PEARCE, JR.

Raleigh's Patent and First Colony. On March 25, 1584, Queen Elizabeth renewed Humphrey Gilbert's patent⁷ of 1578 in the name of Gilbert's half-brother, Walter Raleigh, giving him and his heirs and assigns the right to explore, colonize and govern "such remote, heathen, and barbarous lands not actually possessed of any Christian prince, nor inhabited by Christian people." The settlers planted within this grant were to have "all the privileges of free Denizens, and persons native of England," and all laws passed must be in harmony with the laws of England.

On April 27, 1584, Raleigh sent out an expedition led by Philip Amadas and Arthur Barlowe, who were instructed to explore the country and decide upon the site for a future colony. Coming via the West Indies, they reached the North Carolina coast early in July. They entered Albemarle Sound, took possession of the country in the name of the queen, and a few days later landed at Roanoke Island. After two months spent in exploring and trading with the Indians, they returned to England with reports of the beautiful country, the friendly Indians, the abundance of game and fish and the soil which was "the most plentiful, sweete, fruitfull and wholesome of all the worlde." Queen Elizabeth was pleased; she named the new land "Virginia" and knighted Raleigh.

In April, 1585, Raleigh sent out a colony, consisting of 108 men, with Ralph Lane as governor and Sir Richard Grenville in command of the fleet. This colony landed at Roanoke Island on July 27. About a month later, Grenville returned to England, leaving behind the first English colony in America. Lane built a fort and "sundry necessary and decent dwelling houses," and from this "new Fort in Virginia," Sept. 3, 1585, he wrote Richard Hakluyt in London the "first letter in the English language written from the New World." The Lane colony spent most of its time in a vain quest for gold. Soon supplies began to run low and had to be obtained from the Indians, who were becoming more and more unfriendly. War finally broke out in the spring of 1586. Lane won an easy victory, but unrest and distress continued to increase. When Sir Francis Drake's fleet appeared along the coast and offered to take the colony back to England, Lane consented and they departed after having been on Roanoke Island for about ten months.

About two weeks later, Grenville arrived with supplies. He soon returned to England, but being "unwilling to loose possession of the countrey

which Englishmen had so long held," he left fifteen men on Roanoke Island, "furnished plentifully with all manner of provisions for two years." When the next Raleigh colony (see Raleigh's Lost Colony), headed by John White, arrived at Roanoke in 1587, they found only the bones of one of the men Grenville had left and the fort and houses in ruins.

[C. W. Sams, *The First Conquest of Virginia*.]

HUGH T. LEFLER

Rally: Political, Athletic, Patriotic. The political rally has been an important device in American election campaigns. Gatherings of Jackson men in 1828 appear to have used it first; the practice was extended in the campaign of 1840. Bryan addressed over 600 rallies in 1896, which is probably a record performance. Uniformed brass bands and marching clubs, parades, floats and oratorical spellbinders are used at the rally, whose purpose is not so much to win votes as to keep partisan enthusiasm at a high pitch. Women commonly attended rallies prior to their exercise of the voting privilege. Since the invention of radio⁹⁹ the rally has declined in importance.

Athletic rallies or "pep meetings" have the same purpose. Their rise was attendant upon that of college football⁹⁹. By the 1920's they had penetrated every high school, girls had entered the cheer-leading profession and short courses for yell leaders were given.

Patriotic rallies have been most frequent in wartime, beginning with the Mexican War. During the World War, 75,000 "four-minute men"⁹⁹ were systematically employed to utilize any gathering for patriotic purposes. In our wars with England it was common for officers to order unengaged soldiers to cheer their comrades in battle, from which practice the technique of the rally may have been derived.

[M. Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, II; Mark Sullivan, *Our Times: Over Here*.]

HARVEY L. CARTER

Ralston's Ring, so-called, was a group of financiers in San Francisco, headed by William C. Ralston, who, in the early 1860's, sought to capitalize for their benefit the profits of the Big Bonanza of the Comstock Lode⁹⁹ in Nevada. Stocks were driven up to soaring heights and the opposition of Adolph Sutro was fought by the election of one of the ring, William Sharon, to the United States Senate. The Panic of 1873⁹⁹ almost overthrew the ring but it survived until a second crash in 1875. Ralston, with a deficit of a million and a half dollars, was ousted from the

bank and was found dead on the beach on the following day.

[C. B. Glasscock, *The Big Bonanza*; G. D. Lyman, *Ralston's Ring*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Rambouillet Decree. See Napoleon's Decrees.

Rams, Confederate. The distinguishing feature of these vessels was a massively constructed bow carrying an iron beak or ram, which enabled them to revive the smashing tactics of the ancient galleys. The novelty of their design was the armor-plated casemate constructed amidship to house the artillery. The sides of this citadel were sloped to cause the enemy's cannon balls and projectiles to ricochet. The *Virginia*, first and most famous of this type, was designed by a board consisting of Chief Engineer William P. Williamson, Lt. John M. Brooke and Naval Constructor John L. Porter, appointed by the Confederate Navy Department, June 23, 1861. It was constructed on the salvaged hull of the United States frigate *Merrimack*, which had been sunk at the evacuation of the Norfolk Navy Yard (see *Monitor* and *Merrimack*). The rams were used with much success by the Confederates, who put in service or had under construction 44 ironclad⁹⁹ (armor 4 to 8 inches), 14 partially protected, and 6 cottonclad vessels of this general type.

[*Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion*.]

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

Ranches. Accurately speaking, a ranch is an extent of land on which the pastoral industry is carried on. Horse ranch, sheep ranch, cattle ranch, etc., indicate by name what kind of animals are pastured. In some parts of the West "dudes" have become more profitable than any other animal, and so there are dude ranches. In California a prune orchard, a chicken coop, a tar pit or a wine vat may be—and frequently is—called a ranch; such usage is, however, unwarranted and pretentious; nevertheless, in Mexico and in the Mexicanized border country of the Southwest, Mexicans often refer to any country dwelling as a *rancho*. While the basis of any ranch is the grazing land, the house and contiguous improvements where ranch people dwell is commonly referred to as "the ranch." Thus a stranger meeting a ranchman out in one of the latter's pastures might ask, "How far is it to your ranch?"—meaning ranch quarters. In Texas and some other states the term stock-farm designates a modest-sized tract of land on which grazing is a supplement to agriculture.

Ranches vary in size not only according to the financial powers of the owner but according to

the carrying powers of the land. Along the Gulf Coast in the rainy belt of Texas, one or two acres of land will support a cow; between the Pecos River and the Imperial Valley there are big ranches on which a whole section (640 acres) of land will not "run" ten head of yearlings. Generally speaking, anything under six or seven thousand acres is considered a small ranch. The largest ranch in the United States is the King Ranch in southern Texas, which contains over 1,000,000 acres. There are numerous ranches in Texas comprising from 3000 to 600,000 acres each. The large ranches west and northwest of Texas generally use a considerable amount of government land.

Much more than formerly, ranch owners live in town, utilizing the automobile to get back and forth. Ranch hands are no longer limited to cowboys[™] too proud to do "foot work." The modern cowboy repairs windmills and gasoline engines, digs postholes, cuts fence pickets, puts up hay, builds dirt tanks with scrapers, makes cement troughs, is a fair jackleg carpenter and homemade veterinarian, and can turn his hand to nearly anything. In a drouth he feeds prickly pear and cottonseed cake to cattle; in cloudy summer weather, doctors them for screw worms. There are calves to be branded, horses to break, steers to be gathered for shipping—always something to do on a ranch.

Considering investment and profits over a period of years, the returns from the most profitable of modern ranches would not come up to what the American Telegraph and Telephone Company or the Pennsylvania Railroad call a "fair return." The great majority of ranches are in debt. The nature of their occupation makes them speculators.

Ranches are named after an owner or founder (King Ranch); according to the name of a brand (Turkey Track); or for some other fact or circumstance connected with the ranch (Rock Pile, Santa Rosa, Seven Oaks, etc.). The original name generally remains despite changes of ownership or lessors. Over a widespread territory ranches have been the original units around which human history has been made, and thus are more important historically than many counties. (See also Barbed Wire; Cattle Brands; Cattle Rustlers; Drouths; Horse, The; Longhorns, Texas; Mustangs; Rodeos; Windmills.)

[John Clay, *My Life on the Range*; Ellsworth Collings and Alma Miller England, *The 101 Ranch*; J. Evetts Haley, *The XIT Ranch of Texas*; Frank S. Hastings, *A Ranchman's Recollections*; W. C. Holden, *The Spur Ranch*; Mary Kidder Rak, *A Cowman's Wife*, and *Mountain Cattle*; B. Youngblood and A. B. Cox, *An Economic Study of a Typical Ranching Area*.]

J. FRANK DOBIE

Ranchos del Rey—royal ranches—were established under the Spanish regime in California at San Diego, San Francisco and Monterey. In the year 1800 they possessed 18,000 head of sheep. The California *presidios*[™], which were fortified posts, and sometimes seats of government, were supplied from the royal ranches. The secularization of the missions (see California Missions) in 1825 resulted in the San Diego ranch passing into private hands. Gov. Alvarado gave the *ranch* of Monterey to his brother-in-law, and the other *ranchos* passed into private possession.

[K. Coman, *Economic Beginnings of the Far West*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Randolph, Fort. Fort Blair, built by the British at Point Pleasant[™], after the battle in 1774, was abandoned and destroyed at the beginning of the Revolutionary War in 1775. The Americans built Fort Randolph on its site early in 1776. Cornstalk[™], the friendly Shawnee chief, was murdered there by militiamen in 1777. The fort withstood an attack by Indians in 1778.

[Thomas Condit Miller and Hu Maxwell, *West Virginia and Its People*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Randolph Plan, THE. See Convention of 1787.

Randolph's Commission (1676) made him the special agent of the king to carry to Massachusetts Bay Colony[™] the king's orders that agents be sent to England authorized to act for the colony concerning the boundary disputes with Mason and Gorges[™]. As with the royal commission of 1664 (see Nicolls' Commission) he was also commanded to investigate conditions there, by which it was apparent that the real matter at issue was the king's decision to face the problem of the uncertainty and confusion as to the relationship between Massachusetts and the mother country. During Randolph's month in New England he was to make a complete investigation concerning the governments of the colonies; their methods of defense, finance, religion, trade; character of their laws; and attitude in general, toward each other and toward England. Needless to say, Randolph did not meet with a cordial reception. The government of Massachusetts personally affronted Randolph, and ignored the king's demands, although agents were actually dispatched after Randolph's departure. Upon his return to England he made a comprehensive report, adverse as far as Massachusetts was concerned. Many people had complained to him of religious and political discriminations, and neighboring colonies resented the arrogant attitude of Massachusetts toward them. Most serious of all offenses listed were the flagrant breaches of the Navigation Acts[™] and the denial of parlia-

mentary legislative authority over the colony. Randolph's report caused grave concern at court and was chiefly responsible for the reopening of the fifty-year-old question as to the legal position of the Massachusetts Bay Company which ended in the annulment of the charter in 1684.

[H. L. Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, Vol. III.]

VIOLA F. BARNES

Range Cattle Industry. See Open Range Cattle Period.

Ranger-Drake Engagement. On April 24, 1778, the Continental ship-sloop *Ranger*, eighteen 6-pounders and 123 men, Capt. John Paul Jones commanding, sighted the British ship *Drake*, twenty 4-pounders and 175 men, anchored at Carrickfergus, Ireland. The *Drake*, there expressly to capture Jones, after losing a reconnoitering boat, came out to give battle. Waiting until she came within close range, Jones opened fire. For over an hour he raked the *Drake*. Then with guns silenced she called for quarter. She lost forty-two men, including her principal officers; the *Ranger* had but eight casualties. With much trouble Jones succeeded in working her around Ireland to Brest, France.

[Mrs. Reginald deKoven, *Life and Letters of John Paul Jones*.]

MARION V. BREWINGTON

Rangers, Colonial (1742-83), were irregular provincial forces used in frontier defense, in scouting and in service against Indians. "It is impossible for an Army to act in this Country without Rangers," wrote Loudoun in 1756. Braddock in 1755 asked for one troop of Horse Rangers and four companies of Foot Rangers, "or six, if I can get them." Abercromby appointed Robert Rogers major of a battalion of rangers (see Rogers' Rangers). Four companies raised by him were taken to Louisburg by Amherst in 1758. Wolfe "devised an extended order formation for his light infantry, to work either with line troops, or with rangers." Virginia had five companies, Maryland, one, and North Carolina, one, at Will's Creek, June 8, 1755. These consisted of captain, two subalterns, three sergeants, drummer and fifty-three rank and file. New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York and South Carolina companies served under Rogers. The loyalists' Queen's Rangers served under Simcoe in the Revolution. The colonies, notably Pennsylvania, used rangers for frontier defense in the Revolution. (See also Butler's Rangers.)

[Stanley Pargellis, ed., *Military Affairs in North America, 1748-55*; Franklin B. Hough, ed., *Journal of Robert Rogers*; Caleb Stark, ed., *Reminiscences of the French War*; Hayes Baker-Crothers, *Virginia in the French and Indian*

War; Francis Parkman, *A Half-Century of Conflict and Montcalm and Wolfe*; John Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, Vol. II; *Pennsylvania Archives*, Second Series, Vol. XV, and Third Series, Vol. XXIII.]

DON RUSSELL

Rangers, U. S., were frontier troops on the model of Rogers' Rangers[™]. Seventeen companies, with no field officers, were authorized, 1812-15. A battalion of Mounted Rangers of six companies, commanded by Maj. Henry Dodge, was authorized June 15, 1832, for the Black Hawk War[™], and discontinued March 2, 1833, being replaced by the Regiment of Dragoons.

[Francis B. Heitman, *A Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army*.]

DON RUSSELL

Rappahannock Station, Battle at (Nov. 7, 1863). Meade's army, following Lee after the latter's abortive Bristoe campaign[™], reached Rappahannock Station, where Hays' Confederate division was found holding two formidable redoubts on the north bank of the river. Meade ordered an attack. Artillery fire proving ineffective, the Federals assaulted, sweeping over the works with slight loss and capturing two brigades, over 1600 men. Next day other Federal troops, crossing the Rappahannock at Kelly's Ford[™], turned Lee's right, and he retired behind the Rapidan.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. IV; Douglas S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee*, Vol. III.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Rapist Community. See Harmony Society.

Rate Base. In 1898 the Supreme Court in *Smyth v. Ames*[™] held that a public utility[™] is entitled to charge rates which will yield it a fair return on the fair value of the property it uses in serving the public. Fair value of the property thus constitutes the base on which public utility rate structures rest. Unfortunately the Court was most indefinite as to the method of determining fair value, and an extended controversy developed around that question. The two theories most widely favored have been the actual cost of construction and the present cost of constructing the property in its existing condition. Prudent investment—what the property would have cost originally if constructed under honest and reasonably efficient management—is another and more recent theory.

After 1898 the Court tended to favor cost of reproduction, but in recent cases (279 U. S. 461; 289 U. S. 306) it has held only that cost of reproduction must be taken into consideration.

[Eliot Jones and T. C. Bigham, *Principles of Public Utilities*.]

R. E. WESTMEYER

Raton Pass, on the Colorado-New Mexico boundary, is marked by Raton, N. Mex. For more than two centuries it has been an important gateway between the upper Arkansas basin and eastern New Mexico. The Spanish expedition under Villasur⁹⁹ against the French, in 1720, and the Melgares expedition to intercept Pike⁹⁹, in 1806, used it. One branch of the Santa Fé Trail⁹⁹ passed through it.

[LeRoy R. Hafen, Raton Pass, an Historic Highway, in *The Colorado Magazine*, Vol. VII, No. 5.]

RUPERT N. RICHARDSON

Rattlesnake Flag, a yellow field bearing a coiled rattlesnake and a motto "Dont Tread on Me," used during the French and Indian War⁹⁹ as a colonial symbol, was presented to the Continental Congress⁹⁹ by Christopher Gadsden and unofficially adopted by Capt. Esek Hopkins as a commodore's flag on Dec. 3, 1775.

[G. H. Preble, *History of Flag of United States.*]

MARION V. BREWINGTON

Rattlesnakes. So characteristic is the rattlesnake of America that tradition credits Benjamin Franklin with having proposed it as the national emblem. No creature of the country has entered more into common talk and lore "Rattlesnake master weed" and many other home remedies, whiskey foremost among them, for snakebite, the virtue of rattlesnake oil for rheumatism; legendary dilemmas like that of the lone man on the prairie who crawled into a dry buffalo carcass to hide from Indians and then when an Indian sat down on the carcass to rest heard a rattler begin singing next his body; the cleverness of the roadrunner—which really does kill rattlesnakes—in corralling a sleeping rattler with cactus joints and then making him bite himself to death; the way rattlesnakes "guard" certain caves—in which great numbers do hibernate; certain monsters, rivaling sea-serpents in size; thousands of authentic anecdotes—of such matter must the epic of the rattlesnake of America be some day written.

The largest rattlesnakes, of which there are several species, are found in Florida and Texas. A few people die from bites annually; but the spread of population and its instinctive objection to "rattlers" is steadily diminishing the number.

[Raymond L. Ditmars, *Snakes of the World*]

J. FRANK DOBIE

Rattletrap, THE. See Willing Expedition of 1778-79, THE.

Raw Materials for industry are the products of forests, fields, mines and waters. The enormous abundance of such stuffs within our con-

finer supplies one of the greatest incentives for the growth of the United States to industrial power. The character of exploitation depended on the stage of our economic progress. In the earlier periods demands were relatively simple, but became highly specialized with the modern advance. Differentiation of manufactures made necessary the supply of materials from diversified resources. New requirements have been notable since 1860 when such materials as aluminum, petroleum and its various by-products, and many nonferrous metals, became of great importance.

The fields provide the source of practically all feed- and foodstuffs, of several leading textile fibers, and for many years they afforded the chief supply of fuel. Coal and petroleum are the great power resources, and iron and copper the major metal raw materials, the latter being the main basis for our extensive electrical industries. The age of coal⁹⁹ began in the United States in the decade from 1830 to 1840 when the average annual production was about 310,000 metric tons. It reached the high point in 1929 with 608,000,000 tons. The commercial use of petroleum⁹⁹ dates from about 1860.

The leading agricultural raw materials are wheat, cotton and tobacco⁹⁹. Corn⁹⁹, oats, hay and forage are mainly feedstuffs, although certain quantities are processed in varying degree. Vegetables and fruits most often appear in final consumers' markets in the form in which they were harvested, but these also are raw materials for some manufactures. From the forests come hard and soft woods of many varieties (*see* Lumber Industry). The original timber resources have been reduced to about one half.

In addition to iron and copper⁹⁹, various nonferrous metals have long found important applications in industry. But, as with all raw materials, the uses have been greatly diversified and the output enormously increased. Lead and zinc are in this class. The development of alloy steels, particularly since 1900, created an ever increasing demand for nickel, tungsten, manganese, molybdenum, cobalt, vanadium and chromium. Moreover, a considerable number of uses have been found for the rare elements of the platinum group. The consumption of aluminum⁹⁹ is of rather recent development, but this metal now serves hundreds of purposes. In the last twenty years nickel⁹⁹ has become one of the most important alloy metals, some 2000 of the 8000 standard alloys containing this substance.

A significant feature of modern industrial needs is the necessity of looking beyond our borders for supply. It is no longer true that domestic resources can provide for our varied re-

quirements. International interdependence has become a feature in the progress of American industries as it has been for years in economic expansion abroad. We import large quantities of base metals; also, rubber, gums, resins, waxes, cabinet and other woods, hides, skins, wool, animal and vegetable fats, sugar, tobacco, silk, paper stock, among many others. We also import classes of materials of which we are among the world's largest producers, as with iron ore, copper, wheat. On the other hand, we are large exporters of raw materials. But our position in this respect has changed notably since 1870. Prior to that date we exported mainly raw stuffs and imported manufactures. Now the latter have forged to the front, and we are large importers of raw products. Meanwhile the problem of conservation⁹⁹ of natural resources has come to the fore.

[C. G. Gilbert and J. E. Pogue, *America's Power Resources*; G. O. Smith, *Strategy of Minerals*, J. H. Vanstone, *The Raw Materials of Commerce*.]

ISAAC LIPPINCOTT

Raymond (Miss.), Battle of (May 12, 1863). Having crossed the Mississippi below Vicksburg⁹⁹ and captured Port Gibson⁹⁹, Grant's (U.) army moved to cut the railroad between Vicksburg and Jackson⁹⁹. His right corps, McPherson's, advancing toward Jackson, encountered Gregg's brigade, of Pemberton's army (C.), deployed across the road at Raymond. Logan's division, later supported by Crocker's, attacked Gregg and after a stubborn fight drove him toward Jackson. Next day McPherson reached Clinton, on the railroad, and thus separated Johnston's army (C.), at Jackson, from Pemberton's, defending Vicksburg.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. III.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Rayon Industry. The so-called rayon industry is a branch of the chemical industry, converting cellulose into filaments which are used for textiles. The same chemical process is used to produce cellophane sheets and photographic films.

The process was developed in Europe in 1889 but production was not started in the United States until 1913; cellophane, developed in 1908, was first produced in the United States in 1924.

For a long time, foreign capital and technicians monopolized the manufacture in this country and even in 1939 the largest American producer (the Viscose Co.) was owned in Europe. Gradually, the control exercised through patents has been mitigated and many new developments of major consequence have been made by American operators.

Production of rayon in the United States ex-

ceeded 300,000,000 pounds in 1937 and staple rayon output amounted to 20,000,000 pounds. The rapid development of synthetic textile fibers may be ascribed to the circumstance that they have been designed to be knit and woven on machines already installed in cotton and silk mills.

[Mois H. Avram, *The Rayon Industry*.]

WILLIAM WREN HAY

Raystown Path derives its name from John Wray, an Indian trader who settled sometime before 1750 at what is now Bedford, Pa. It led from a point near Carlisle, Pa., in the Susquehanna Valley to Shannopin's Town (now within Pittsburgh) and Logstown, eighteen miles below Pittsburgh. The trail, in terms of present-day towns, went from Carlisle through Shippenburg, Chambersburg, Fort Loudon, Fort Lyttleton, Bedford and Ligonier; then north toward Latrobe, Harrison City, Trafford and Shannopin's Town. This route in the main was the same as that followed by Gen. Forbes in 1758 and by Col. Henry Bouquet in 1763⁹⁹. Much of it today parallels closely the Lincoln Highway⁹⁹ west from Chambersburg to Pittsburgh.

[George P. Donehoo, *A History of the Indian Villages and Place Names in Pennsylvania*; Charles A. Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail*.]

R. J. FERGUSON

Razorback Hogs, once common all over the South and still extant, derive from European importation. Many of them were as wild and fierce as the wild boars of the Old World, and hunting them was a great sport. Every settler had his "hog claim," though it often took guns, dogs and canebrake fire to make it good. The animal is distinguished by snout, tail, tusk, skin and sinew rather than by fat and flesh. In early days a superior razorback could "outfight a bear and outrun a nigger." The animal remains the subject of a cycle of folk jokes and tales.

[J. Frank Dobie, *A Vaquero of the Brush Country*.]

J. FRANK DOBIE

Readjuster Movement, THE, in Virginia had its inception in the contention of Rev. John E. Massey, Col. Frank G. Ruffin and a few others that the ante-bellum state debt, which had been funded in 1871, ought to be "readjusted" so that it could be met without ruin to farmer taxpayers (already hard pressed by economic conditions) or neglect of public schools and charities. Gen. William Mahone, seeking the Democratic gubernatorial nomination, endorsed the idea in 1877, swung the Richmond *Whig* to its support and in 1879 organized the Readjuster party. Win-

ning the legislature in 1879, with the help of the disorganized Republican voters, and the governorship in 1881 the new party scaled the debt by the "Riddleberger Bill" of 1882, enacted laws in the economic and social interest of the masses and, carefully guided by Mahone, apportioned the offices among its leaders. Elected to the Senate (where he was soon joined by H. H. Riddleberger), Mahone co-operated with the Republicans and received the Federal patronage on the theory that he stood for anti-Bourbonism and a fair vote. Thus supported the Negroes rallied unanimously to his standard while many of the whites continued faithful. His machine now seemed invincible. But the Democrats, led by John S. Barbour and John W. Daniel, accepted the debt settlement; welcomed back such sincere Readjusters as Massey and Ruffin, who would not brook Mahone's "bossism"; drew the color line, and won in 1883 and thereafter, though sometimes very narrowly. Perhaps the most lasting result of the movement, aside from the debt settlement, was the fixed belief among the white masses that, while the Negro could vote, white men must not divide however important the issues on which they differed and however "rotten" the Democratic machine.

[C. C. Pearson, *The Readjuster Movement in Virginia*; N. M. Blake, *William Mahone*.] C. C. PEARSON

Reaper, Invention of and Development of. The modern tractor-combine is separated from the cradle-scythe of a century ago by five chief steps in mechanical development, viz, reaper (1840-60), self-rake reaper (1860-70), harvester (1870-75), wire binder (1875-80), and twine binder (1880-1915). These dates indicate approximately when each implement exemplified the latest method of reaping, and not that it was then cutting most of the world's grain. This machine sequence does not include the header, header-thresher, header-binder, and tractor-header-combine which evolved during the same century for use in dry-farming⁹⁹ areas where grain, without damage from sweating, can be reaped and threshed simultaneously.

The notable contribution of invention to the Industrial Revolution⁹⁹ probably stimulated the threescore Englishmen and Americans between 1785 and 1830 who tried in vain to construct a practical horsepower grain-cutter. The machines of Henry Ogle of England and Patrick Bell of Scotland, however, included elements prophetic of the earliest successful reaper, the 1831 invention of Cyrus Hall McCormick⁹⁹ of Midway, Va. His machine first combined harmoniously the seven principles or parts essential to efficient

reaping, viz., side draft, reciprocating horizontal knife, main ground wheel, divider, fingers, reel and platform.

Obed Hussey's rival invention of 1833 foreshadowed the modern mower as developed after 1850 by Lewis F. Miller and Ephraim Ball of Ohio, and Cyrenus Wheeler, Jr., and Moses G. Hubbard of New York. Hussey, at Baltimore, and Hiram Moore of Michigan greatly improved the knife and fingers.

Competition between manufacturers in the late 1850's, and the spur given to invention by labor scarcity during the Civil War, brought the self-rake reaper to perfection and encouraged experimentation with harvesters and automatic binders. William H. Seymour and Samuel Johnston of New York, and Owen Dorsey, Benjamin Fitzhugh and McClintock Young of Maryland merit remembrance for their self-rake attachments. In 1858 Charles W. and William W. Marsh of Illinois discovered how to elevate grain over the main wheel to a table where it could be bound by riding bandsters. This harvester had no wide sale for about a decade. Shortly thereafter Sylvanus D. Locke, Charles B. Withington and S. D. Carpenter, all of Wisconsin, and James F. and John H. Gordon of New York substituted their wire-binding attachment for the human binders on the harvester. Protests of millers and cattle raisers against "wire in wheat" assured an early and ready acceptance of the twine binding device of John F. Appleby of Wisconsin. He co-ordinated into an efficient whole the separate inventions of Marquis L. Gorham, Jacob Behel and George H. Spaulding, all of Illinois. Compared with the early McCormick reaper, the self-rake reaper and harvester-binder greatly reduced the labor (rather than the time) cost of harvesting. Inventors after 1860 were usually in the employ of the big manufacturers.

Twentieth-century "power-farming," hastened by World War prosperity and the rising automobile industry, demands that a tractor⁹⁹ shall draw the harvester-binder, windrow harvester, or harvester-thresher (combine⁹⁹) and operate its moving parts. C. W. Hart and C. H. Parr of Iowa in 1901 adapted the Otto internal combustion engine to movable use on the farm. Thereafter, they and the larger harvesting manufacturing concerns, as well as Henry Ford between 1918 and 1928, lightened and perfected the "all-use" tractor; made it less expensive, and convinced many farmers that kerosene or gasoline could well supplant animals, or even steam, as the motive power in harvesting.

[M. F. Miller, *The Evolution of Reaping Machines*, U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Office of Experiment

Stations, *Bulletin No. 103*; R. L. Ardrey, *The Harvesting Machine Industry*, *Scientific American Supplement*, Dec. 20, 1902; C. H. McCormick, Jr., *The Century of the Reaper*; W. T. Hutchinson, *Cyrus Hall McCormick*.]

WILLIAM T. HUTCHINSON

Rebates. A rebate has been defined by the Interstate Commerce Commission⁹ as "transportation at a less rate in dollars and cents than the published rate which the shipping public are charged." The intent of a carrier in granting a rebate is usually to discriminate in favor of a particular shipper by giving him a secret rate which is less than that charged his competitors. This practice developed out of the spectacular railroad rate wars¹⁰ that took place during the latter half of the 19th century and which often proved disastrous to carriers and public alike. These costly rate wars led carriers to avoid general rate cuts and to develop the practice of making secret agreements with certain shippers whereby the shipper would get some form of rate reduction in exchange for his promise to ship his goods over the line offering the concession. Such concessions enabled the favored shippers to undersell their competitors, and thus increase their business and the business of the railroad offering the rebates.

The public objected bitterly to the practice of rebating because of its obvious unfairness and because the process of building up one shipper at the expense of others promoted the development of monopolies¹¹ with all of their attendant evils. Rebating also proved objectionable to those carriers who practised it because it did not take long for competing carriers to size up the situation and attempt to make secret arrangements of their own with other shippers, and if they were successful, none of the carriers enjoyed an increase in traffic. And if a carrier did succeed in building up a shipper to a monopolistic position, that carrier was at the mercy of the shipper, and such shippers sometimes secured enormous concessions by playing one carrier off against another.

The outstanding recipient of railroad rebates was the Standard Oil Company¹², and much of its early success may be traced to the advantages it enjoyed in the way of rate concessions. In one case the published rate on oil between two points was 35¢ a barrel, but on each barrel shipped the Standard received a 25¢ rebate, making its rate 10¢ while its competitors paid 35¢. Not only did the Standard receive the 25¢ refund on all the oil it shipped, but it also received 25¢ for every barrel shipped by its competitors. This type of rebate in which a particular shipper is given a part of the rate paid by his competitors

is known as a drawback. The packers were also notorious recipients of rate concessions.

The Interstate Commerce Act (1887) prohibited rate discrimination and established a fine of \$5000 for each violation, and two years later violation of the law was made a penitentiary offense. However, it was necessary to prove that a rebate actually resulted in discrimination, and this was difficult to do. Furthermore, juries were reluctant to send men to prison for civil offenses even if proven guilty. Hence the act did not stop the practice of discrimination and further legislation was necessary. Under the Elkins Act¹³ (1903) any departure from a printed rate was considered an offense, thus eliminating the necessity of proving that discrimination existed. At the same time the penalty of imprisonment was dropped, the maximum fine raised to \$20,000, and the law applied to shippers who received rebates as well as to carriers who granted them. The Hepburn Act¹⁴ (1906) restored the penalty of imprisonment and subjected the receiver of a rebate to a fine equal to three times the value of the rebates received during the preceding six years. Subsequent acts brought a further tightening of the law, and today rebating is practically unknown.

[W. Z. Ripley, *Railroads, Rates and Regulation*.]

R. E. WESTMEYER

Rebel Yell was the description given by Union soldiers and the general public to the high-pitched shout used by the Confederates in spirited charges and violent clashes upon the battlefields of the Civil War. With passing generations, the once familiar "hy-eeee" of the men in gray is used rarely and recorded mainly in reminiscences.

ALFRED P. JAMES

Rebellion, Right of. Rebellion is organized armed resistance to the ruler or government of one's country; the open or determined defiance of, or resistance to, any authority or controlling power (*Oxford Dictionary*). According to the most generally accepted political theory of today a law is a command, a general rule of human action enforced by a sovereign political authority (T. E. Holland). Hence disobedience to authority or rebellion can never be legal and the right of rebellion can exist only on moral grounds.

However, according to the theory of John Locke, governmental powers were fiduciary (see Locke's *Influence on American Political Thought*) and the right of revolution existed when a government abused or ill-used this authority or oppressed its people. The community of citizens was the judge when this oppressive

or unjust administration existed, and when rebellion actually was justified. It was largely upon this basis that the American patriots justified their rebellion against Great Britain and issued the Declaration of Independence⁹⁹. Also, the leaders of the Southern Confederacy⁹⁹ at the time of the Civil War in a great measure justified their attempted secession⁹⁹ from the Union upon the same theoretical grounds.

[T. E. Holland, *Jurisprudence*; C. E. Merriam, *American Political Theories*.]

WILLIAM STARR MYERS

Rebellions. See Insurrections, Domestic.

Recall, THE, is a special election to determine whether a public officeholder shall be superseded before the expiration of his term. First introduced in the Los Angeles charter of 1903 this device found wide acceptance subsequently in municipal charters, chiefly of the home rule, commission and city-manager types⁹⁹⁹. Oregon was the first state to make the recall applicable by constitutional amendment to its elective officials (1908); eleven other states have since followed the example thus set, viz., California, Arizona, Nevada, Colorado, Idaho, Washington, Michigan, Kansas, Louisiana, North Dakota and Wisconsin. Particularly bitter controversy broke out early over the application of the recall to the judiciary. President Taft vetoed the enabling act admitting Arizona to the Union because its proposed constitution included a provision making judges subject to recall. The offending clause was accordingly stricken out, but a year after the admission of Arizona (1912) it was restored to the constitution. Of the twelve recall states four expressly exempt judicial officials, viz., Idaho, Washington, Michigan and Louisiana.

Besides opposition to the recall on the above ground, it was attacked as unconstitutional, even revolutionary, in that it substituted a dangerous form of direct democratic rule for representative republican institutions. Experience has dissipated exaggerated views of this character; as a rule the states and cities in which the recall exists regard it as useful in a cautionary way against officials tempted to neglect or malfeasance.

All recall laws guarantee a certain period of grace, usually six months, before it can be invoked. After the expiration of this period petitions may be circulated against the erring official or officials. To be effective petitions require the signatures of a certain percentage of the voters of the district concerned, ranging from 10% to 35%, 25% being the most common. After the required number of signatures are secured a special recall election is ordered to take

place within from twenty to ninety days. At this election the fate of the official under fire is determined in competition with a candidate or candidates nominated against him.

[F. L. Bird and F. M. Ryan, *The Recall of Public Officials*.]

ROBERT C. BROOKS

Recapture Clause. A clause of the Transportation Act of 1920⁹⁹ provided that any railroad earning profits in excess of 6% should pay one half of the excess into a general railroad revolving fund to be used by the Interstate Commerce Commission⁹⁹ to make loans to carriers to meet expenditures on capital account or to refund maturing obligations. It was held constitutional in 1924 by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Dayton Goose Creek Railway v. United States* (263 U. S. 456; 68 L. Ed. 388; 44 Sup. Ct. 169). The clause was repealed by the Emergency Transportation Act of 1933 and all deposits were refunded to the carriers in proportion to the share which each had paid.

[D. P. Locklin, *Economics of Transportation*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Recession of 1937. After the settlement of the banking crisis of 1933⁹⁹, business staged one of the most rapid recoveries in the history of the country, *The Annalist* index of business activity rising approximately 50% between March and July of 1933. A reaction set in, however, and business activity fell off about 25% between the latter month and October, 1934. Thereafter it increased irregularly by more than 50% up to the close of 1936. This level was fairly well maintained through August, 1937, when a decline set in which was as rapid as the recovery of 1933 had been and resulted in a reduction of business activity of 27% by the end of the year. A further sharp decline in activity occurred in the first six months of 1938, after which *The Annalist* index turned sharply upward to the end of the year. Stock prices followed a course similar to business activity, rising rapidly from the beginning of 1935 to 1937, falling sharply to the spring of 1938, and then turning again upward. Although the recession of 1937-38 was unusually severe, no panic ensued either in the stock market or in business.

[*The Annalist*, 1937-38; *Federal Reserve Bulletins*, 1937-38.]

FREDERICK A. BRADFORD

Reciprocal Trade Agreements. The Democrats, in their successful campaign of 1932⁹⁹, advocated "a competitive tariff for revenue . . . [and] reciprocal trade agreements with other nations. . . ." On June 12, 1934, Congress approved an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930.

This so-called Trade Agreements Act authorized the President, whenever he finds that import restrictions of the United States or foreign countries are unduly burdening American foreign trade, to enter into foreign trade agreements and to proclaim the changes in duties necessary to carry out such agreements, provided that existing rates are not changed by more than 50% and that no change is made in the free list. By providing for executive agreements rather than treaties, Congress made Senate ratification unnecessary.

The act further provided that the proclaimed duties should apply to imports from all foreign countries unless the President discovers evidence of discriminatory treatment of American commerce by any country. In other words, the unconditional most-favored-nation policy⁹⁰, followed since 1922 in American commercial treaties, was to be continued in these executive agreements. This principle of bargaining with the principal supplier of an import, obtaining suitable concessions, concluding an agreement with that country, and then "generalizing" the duty reductions to all most-favored nations without a direct *quid pro quo* was actively defended by Secretary of State Cordell Hull as nondiscriminatory and hence conducive to world peace, against the attacks of proponents of the strictly bi-lateral or conditional system.

An elaborate governmental machinery has been created, centering in the State and Commerce Departments and the Tariff Commission⁹¹, to ascertain what concessions may be offered and should be requested in any negotiation, and to hold public hearings. The first agreement was concluded in August, 1934, with Cuba, and by November, 1939 (the act having been extended in 1937 for an additional three years), agreements had been concluded with twenty-one countries, including Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia (agreement declared inoperative after the German occupation), France, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom, and were pending with several others, notably Argentina. Measurement of the results of the program—admittedly partially intangible—is difficult and controversial. Official statistics show that foreign trade with agreement countries increased by a materially greater percentage than with nonagreement countries. As the number of agreements has increased, the number of duty reductions has correspondingly increased, which has resulted in much determined but thus-far (1939) unsuccessful opposition from tariff-protected industry and agriculture.

[Francis B. Sayre, *The Way Forward*; Henry J. Tasca, *The Reciprocal Trade Policy of the United States*.]

FRANK A. SOUTHARD, JR.

Reciprocity in international commercial policy involves agreement to grant concessions from prevailing tariff⁹² rates in return for concessions from other treaty parties. In some cases the arrangement is for mutual free trade in certain articles. As a rule, throughout the history of the United States, this country has operated on the basis of a single-line tariff, as contrasted with multilinear adjustments as practised by some European countries. Under our regime a tariff is a rigid affair unless relaxed by treaties. Reciprocity in the United States has usually come forward under the spell of some particular influence (as with the rise of interest in Latin-American trade about 1890, and later with the Hull treaties of the 1930's) designed to penetrate foreign tariff walls and thus assist in restoring a normal volume to international commerce. The first real experiment with reciprocity was with Canada, 1854-66 (see Canadian-American Relations; Elgin-Marcy Treaty). The discussions were complicated with questions concerning the fisheries⁹³ and navigation of the St. Lawrence. In the final agreement concessions were made on both these issues and mutual free trade was accepted between the two countries on a considerable list of commodities. In 1875 a treaty was negotiated with Hawaii by which raw sugar and molasses, among other items, were admitted free in return for free admission into the islands of certain commodities from the United States. This treaty was extended by the convention of 1887. A reciprocity movement which attracted considerable attention was inaugurated by James G. Blaine who, as Secretary of State under Garfield and later under Harrison, promoted the idea of better trade relations with Latin America (see Pan-American Conferences). One result was the inclusion of a reciprocity provision in the McKinley tariff⁹⁴ of 1890. The ground had largely been prepared for this move in the deliberations of the Pan-American congress which assembled in Washington in 1889. One of the first treaties was with Brazil. This was proclaimed by President Harrison on Feb. 5, 1891. It provided that in return for free admission into the United States of sugar, molasses, coffee and hides, Brazil would admit free a number of agricultural products; also coal, tar, agricultural implements, mining machinery, among others. The list included, also, articles which Brazil admitted at a 25% reduction of duty. Agreements were made with a number of other Latin-American countries and with several European nations. The tariff act of 1894 (see

Gorman-Wilson Tariff) practically annulled the reciprocity arrangements. The principle was reaffirmed in the Dingley tariff⁷⁷ of 1897, but was applied in a different manner. The experiment came to an end with the tariff act of 1909 (*see* Payne-Aldrich Tariff). In 1911 Congress agreed to a reciprocity treaty with Canada, but strong opposition among our neighbors across the border led to abandonment of the idea. The troubles of world commerce after the World War, and the notable decline in international trade following the Panic of 1929⁷⁸, called forth another reciprocity move. Most nations had raised tariff barriers to great heights and had surrounded trade with such handicaps as quotas, exchange control, and, with some articles, absolute prohibition of import. To meet this situation Congress enacted the law of June 12, 1934, which amended the act of 1930. The President was authorized to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements⁷⁹, the object being to obtain gradually, by agreement with countries individually, a lowering of rates throughout the world. By 1939 twenty-one of these Hull treaties had been consummated and others were in prospect.

[F. W. Taussig, *Tariff History of the United States.*]

ISAAC LIPPINCOTT

Reclamation refers to the bringing of land under cultivation. In a larger sense every land law designed to promote settlement has been a part of the process. In a narrower sense the term refers to the utilization of land considered worthless without extraordinary effort and considerable capital outlay. In this sense the history of reclamation has been twofold. First, it has been the story of the reclaiming of swamp or overflowed lands, and, second, the story of the utilization of arid or desert lands.

The first congressional legislation relating to swamplands was in 1849. This act provided for a grant of land to the State of Louisiana. By an act of Sept. 28, 1850, Congress ceded to the then existing public land states⁸⁰ the larger portion of the swampland, providing that the proceeds of said lands should be applied, "exclusively, so far as necessary, to the purpose of reclaiming said lands by means of levees and drains." By the act of March 12, 1860, the grant was extended to Minnesota and Oregon, making the total number of states receiving the grant fifteen. Of the estimated 79,000,000 acres of swamp and overflowed lands in the United States, some 64,000,000 acres have been granted to the states.

The administration of the act was characterized by fraud and incompetency. Thousands of acres were selected by the states as swamplands

which could scarcely be called either swamp or overflowed lands. Moreover, the states in disposing of the lands disregarded the express provisions of the act relating to the utilization of the proceeds from the lands. The proceeds were often used for the construction of roads, bridges and public buildings. Lands were often granted to railroads and in some cases to counties who sold the land at ridiculously low prices. The income from the land to the states was small and the amount of land reclaimed was comparatively insignificant.

In the reclaiming of arid lands three policies have been pursued. The first was by the encouragement of individual initiative under the Desert Land Act of 1877⁸¹. By this act the Government sold up to 640 acres, at \$1.25 per acre, to any individual who would reclaim the land within three years. The second was the stimulation of state and corporate enterprise by the Carey Act of 1894⁸². By this act the Federal Government agreed to cede to the states up to 1,000,000 acres, provided the state in each case would cause the land to be irrigated and settled. The third was reclamation by the Federal Government under the Newlands Act or the Reclamation Act of 1902. By this act the Government agreed to take the proceeds from the sale of public lands for the development of irrigation projects. The settlers were to agree to repay the cost of construction, thus creating a permanent revolving fund for the construction of irrigation works.

Under the Desert Land Act there was considerable fraud but nevertheless most of the land irrigated in the United States has been by private enterprise, and a goodly portion under the Desert Land Act. Under the Carey Act some 4,000,000 acres have been segregated but less than 1,000,000 acres have been irrigated. Under the Newlands Act the Federal Government has constructed twenty-nine projects irrigating about 2,000,000 acres or about 10% of the total land irrigated in the United States.

[B. H. Hibbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies.*]

JOHN T. GANOE

Recognition, Policy of. The executive branch of the Federal Government has exercised exclusive jurisdiction in the recognition of a foreign state or government. In extending recognition the President usually negotiates treaties, sends or receives an accredited minister, secures an exchange of ministers, issues credentials to the diplomat who represented the United States during the previous government and makes public declarations.

The criteria for granting recognition to a

state or a government are: (1) its stability and probability of endurance; (2) its disposition and competence to meet international obligations.

Jefferson, the author of American recognition policy, emphasized stability. With America becoming a world power, the second criterion has received the greater emphasis.

Since American independence was won by means of revolution, the United States could hardly deny the right to employ this means to others. Jefferson said that "every nation has a right to govern itself under what form it pleases and to change these forms at its own will; and externally to transact business with other nations through whatever organ it chooses. . . . The only thing essential is the will of the nation." Jackson insisted that "the uniform policy and practice of the United States is . . . to recognize the prevailing party eventually without reference to our own particular interests and views or merits of the controversy." Buchanan said that the United States "has from its origin, always recognized *de facto* governments. . . . We do not go behind the existing Government to involve ourselves in the question of legitimacy." The prevailing government must be "capable of maintaining itself." During the Civil War, Seward never denied the right of revolution. Were a change to be made by force "the new administration shall be sanctioned by the formal acquiescence and acceptance of the people."

In the 20th century the President has insisted that a new government must be able and willing to fulfil its international obligations. As evidence one can offer Theodore Roosevelt's "big stick diplomacy" and Taft's "dollar diplomacy." Wilson refused recognition to governments created by *coup d'états* because the will of the people, he believed, had been suppressed. He opposed autocratic governments and favored democracies. During Wilson's administration and subsequently the Federal Government delayed or withheld recognition if it disapproved of the existing political order. This practice is not, however, a complete break with precedent. The nation's policy has been continuous (*see* Non-recognition Policy).

In 1932, to discourage aggression, Stimson declared that the United States refused "to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement . . . [effected] contrary . . . to the Pact of Paris" (*see* Stimson Nonrecognition Doctrine). *De facto* governments will eventually be recognized if they show stability and a willingness to fulfil their international obligations.

[J. B. Moore, *Digest of International Law*; C. C. Hyde, *International Law Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States*; Taylor Cole, *The Recognition Policy of the United States since 1901*.]

GEORGE D. HARMON

Recollects, THE. *See* Franciscans, The.

Reconstruction. Following the close of the Civil War⁹ in 1865 the people of the United States passed through a troubled decade which showed how unfortunately a military victory may be used when matters fall into the hands of partisan extremists (*see* Radical Republicans). Had kindlier counsels prevailed the seceded states might quickly have been restored, for popular detestation of the Union had never been as violent as the language of Southern leaders and to many of the war-weary the failure of Southern independence, besides being a patent fact, seemed almost a minor thing when compared to the relief of having the war over. Southern pride was not so much broken as it was now dissociated from the motive of preserving a separate Confederacy⁹, just as "Southern rights" before the war had been far from synonymous with secession⁹. Every one of the seceded commonwealths, in fact, stood ready to renounce secession, repudiate the anti-United States debt and abolish slavery⁹. Many a Southern leader in this postwar phase reviewed his former attitude with emphasis upon his original opposition to secession. Military leaders labored to promote a rapid and easy restoration, the main terms of such a policy being actually embodied in the Johnston-Sherman articles of surrender which were rudely overruled by Secretary of War Stanton. Surrender terms as applied, however, did involve the important provision that men and officers of the Confederate Army, going home on parole, would be unmolested and held to no prosecution by the Federal Government. Military imprisonment without trial was imposed upon some of the Southern civil leaders, the terms being short except in the case of the two-year imprisonment of Jefferson Davis⁹.

The war ended with no restoration policy in operation. Lincoln's generous plan of reconstruction⁹, announced in December, 1863, had been attempted in several states without being made legally effective; nor had the anti-Lincoln faction of Republicans (the radicals) succeeded in enacting their own severe measure (the Wade-Davis Bill⁹) which fell before a presidential veto. Lincoln's last speech (April 11, 1865) was an ardent and reasoned appeal for statesman-like reconstruction, and President Johnson, keeping Lincoln's Cabinet, strove earnestly to pro-

mote the essentials of his predecessor's program. Constitutional devices for state remaking were readily available, and in the interval between his accession and the assembling of Congress (April–December, 1865) Johnson made such use of these democratic methods that by July, 1865 "all Secessia" was well advanced on the road to reorganization. Except for congressional approval the process was practically completed by early December.

The 1865 phase, however, was but prelude or interlude. The men who controlled Congress, seeing the Republican party doomed if Southern state governments were restored with Federal representation, seized the reins of government and held them in opposition to the President and the moderates who agreed with him. Soon they became masters of party machinery and of Congress, denounced as traitors all except their own brand of Republicans, and succeeded by the end of the "critical year" (1866) in making their will dominant at Washington and in the occupied South. For this purpose they used the caucus and the party lash; ostracized those who would not travel with them; set up a dictatorial Joint Committee on Reconstruction²⁰; denied congressional seats to opponents; and enacted measures to bring the states, the army, the electoral college, the Cabinet, and even the Supreme Court, within the orbit of their control. In the impeachment²¹ and trial of President Johnson they failed by only one vote to seize the Presidency, but such seizure was hardly necessary since the overriding of vetoes had eliminated Johnson as a force that could obstruct radical legislation. The failure to fasten any proved accusation upon the President did not prevent his opponents from besmudging his name by innuendo, whispering campaigns, perjured slander and unfair propaganda. The attack upon the Supreme Court included a whole vocabulary of denunciation and an arsenal of weapons held in reserve, a potent weapon being actually used when the Court's jurisdiction was curtailed by Congress to prevent a review of the *McCardle* case²² involving military power associated with reconstruction. That the radicals did not go much farther in this field was probably due to judicial acquiescence. Annihilating the Court, remodeling or packing it, modifying its procedure, and denying it jurisdiction over reconstruction cases were among the radical proposals of this period, and in 1869 by a vote of 99 to 50 (*Congressional Globe*, 41 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 345) the Republican House of Representatives passed a judiciary-bill amendment which provided that any Federal judge on reaching the age of seventy

after ten years of service might retire on full pay, or, for every case of a failure of a judge to retire at this age, the President might appoint an additional judge with the same powers and duties. The whole bill was passed by the House with this amendment by a vote of 90 to 53 (*ibid.*), but in the enacted law this clause was dropped.

How far the American people willed what was happening will always be a question. Both Lincoln and Johnson, elected by popular vote in 1864, had favored nonradical reconstruction as had also the Democratic candidate, McClellan. In 1868 the Republicans avoided Negro suffrage as a campaign issue. Much of the support that was obtained resulted from propaganda which represented the South as defiantly determined, as in its "black codes,"²³ to re-establish slavery, despite Southern ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment²⁴ which became a part of the Constitution in December, 1865. That there was sizable opposition to the radicals even in Congress is shown by the fact that the veto of the freedmen's bureau bill was overridden in the House by a vote of 104 to 33, with 45 not voting (July 16, 1866). There were various absentees, and the South, as in this whole period, was unrepresented.

While the South was held under by Federal troops the radicals slowly developed their legislative program. The multifarious activities of the freedmen's bureau²⁵ of the War Department were pushed deep into Southern local affairs, while the agents of the bureau, as well as those of the Union League²⁶ in the South, functioned as party emissaries. By the Civil Rights Act of 1866²⁷ citizenship was given a new definition and civil rights a Federal guarantee against state interference. Though speaking unctuously in constitutional terms the radicals showed in reality as little regard for the Constitution as they did for judicial standards in the impeachment proceeding. Finding their Fourteenth Amendment²⁸ defeated when submitted for ratification because of Southern unwillingness to disfranchise their leaders, the radicals revived it, made adoption the price of state readmission, promoted ratification by fabricated governments in the South, and by an unprecedented action (an undebated concurrent resolution, July 21, 1868) took over the promulgation of the amendment after the proclamation of the Secretary of State (Seward) had left the question of its proper adoption dangling in ambiguity. In the sequel this amendment, by court interpretation, proved a mighty protection to corporations against regulation by state governments while the courts did but little to apply it as a guarantee of equal rights for the Negro.

The Fifteenth Amendment⁷⁰ (1870) has been likewise ineffective as a means of practically guarding the Negro from discrimination in the matter of suffrage.

By a remarkable series of "reconstruction acts,"⁷¹ 1867-68, some of which had to be altered directly after passage, the Congress launched its artificial system for the South. Major generals in command of military districts were put over the Southern people, newcomers from the North were enfranchised after the briefest residence and native Southerners were disfranchised for supporting the lost cause. Negro voting and officeholding became an important feature of the system years in advance of the Negro-suffrage amendment. Election procedures, including registration of voters, were put into the hands of "boards" operated as party machines. What followed was the regime of the carpetbagger and the scalawag⁷² with its bogus political devices, fraudulent balloting, bribery, extravagance, Negro-militia excesses and numerous episodes of exploitation and plunder.

Some of the Southerners preserved a quiescent attitude during this period, some adopted the "Mississippi plan"⁷³ of worrying Republican meetings, some labored through party conventions for an increasing application of conservative influence; others, especially the rougher element, struck back by the violent methods of the Ku Klux Klan⁷⁴. Counter retaliation by the Federal Government led to various "force acts"⁷⁵ and the vigorous suppression of the Klan which became virtually extinct by 1871. Through all this, the Negro, whose record under slavery had been in the main that of faithful servant, was more the tool of scheming white politicians than the perpetrator of abuse. Similarly Negro officeholding (e.g., in state legislatures and Congress) was less a formative factor than a sensational spectacle. It is a significant fact that the worst abominations of reconstruction came after the readmission of the states to representation in the Federal Congress, a process mainly achieved in 1868 and completed in 1871. In the old historiography, as in the Congress of postwar days, this readmission was played up as the main factor in reconstruction, though it is now recognized that intrastate conditions, especially in the social and economic sense, were far more vital. It is even true that those states whose "reconstruction" in the congressional sense was delayed, were the more fortunate ones. Reconstruction history as now rewritten also recognizes the tariff and the influence of eastern bankers in the whole story. Indeed the "gilded age"⁷⁶ is hardly intelligible (e.g., as to the sectional character of the national

banking system) if the postwar capitalistic upswing is left out of account.

Gradually self-rule came to the states of the South, though not without a vicious period of civil strife between rival governments, especially in Louisiana (see Home Rule, Restoration of, in the South). In 1876 only three states (Louisiana, Florida, South Carolina) remained under radical Republican rule, but the use of party machines in these states proved an essential factor in the seating of President Hayes (see Campaign of 1876). The prompt withdrawal of Federal troops in 1877 signified Republican recognition of the failure of the postwar regime to whose processes Hayes (a minority candidate) owed his office. From that period Southern commonwealths have been torn by feuds between Bourbon and populist and have witnessed demagogic appeals which hark back to the 1860's and 1870's, but at least these commonwealths have been their own masters in state affairs. The transition in 1877 was not altogether abrupt. In a real sense the new South dates from Appomattox⁷⁷ which was in truth the "end of an era." Economic and social rehabilitation proceeded through the darkest of carpetbag days, so that a down-trodden or self-pitying South was never the whole picture (see Civil War, Economic Consequences of, South). Time, intertravel, investment, Northern philanthropy, the rise of Southern literature and the friendly approach of the Cleveland administration are among the factors that have stimulated progress on the "road to reunion." Confederate disabilities were ended by the amnesty⁷⁸ act of 1898, executive clemency having been fully applied by 1868. By 1900 the old wounds had been measurably healed. Yet it would be an exaggerated optimism to overemphasize the success of reconciliation. Southern effects of the sequel of Appomattox have not been easy to live down. Memories of vindictive rule have outlasted the scars of war, and such a persisting pattern as the "solid South"⁷⁹ takes its character largely from deep-seated feelings in the carpetbag years.

[General histories of the period have been written by E. P. Oberholtzer and by J. F. Rhodes. See also: Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction*; Claude G. Bowers, *The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln*; Walter L. Fleming, *Documentary History of Reconstruction*, and *The Sequel of Appomattox*; Robert S. Henry, *The Story of Reconstruction*; George Fort Milton, *The Age of Hate: Andrew Johnson and the Radicals*; Allan Nevins, *The Emergence of Modern America, 1865-1878*; J. G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction*.]

J. G. RANDALL

Reconstruction, Lincoln's Plan of. In his proclamation of Dec. 8, 1863, President Lincoln of-

tered pardon^o, with certain exceptions, to those who would take oath to support the Constitution of the United States and abide by Federal laws and proclamations touching slaves. When oath-takers equal in number to one tenth of the state's voters in 1860 should "re-establish" a government in a seceded commonwealth, Lincoln promised executive recognition to such government without commitment as to congressional recognition. Both the "plan" and the whole Southern policy of Lincoln were denounced as far too lenient, and there followed a storm of controversy with the radicals (*see* Radical Republicans) who by their control of Congress prevented any settlement of this vital problem during Lincoln's life. The hopeless deadlock between President and Congress was seen in the radical Wade-Davis bill^o which Lincoln killed by a pocket veto. After this Lincoln issued a proclamation (July 8, 1864) explaining that he could not accept the radical plan as the only method of reconstruction and was promptly answered by Wade and Davis in a truculent manifesto. No state was actually restored in accordance with Lincoln's plan, though he considered his terms fulfilled in Tennessee, Arkansas and Louisiana. In Virginia he considered that a loyal government already existed. Lincoln's secretary, John Hay, was sent to assist in the reorganization of Florida, and the President's policy became entangled with intra-party rows concerning delegates' votes for 1864. In his last public speech Lincoln urged generosity in restoring the states and in his last Cabinet meeting (April 14) he advised leniency toward the defeated South.

[Eben G. Scott, *Reconstruction during the Civil War*; Charles H. McCarthy, *Lincoln's Plan of Reconstruction*; J. G. Randall, *The Civil War and Reconstruction*.]

J. G. RANDALL

Reconstruction Acts. THE. Success in the election of 1866 gave the Radical Republicans^o both the authority and the opportunity to put an end to President Johnson's plan of reconstruction^o and to substitute one of their own, that would give them complete control of the "conquered provinces." The so-called reconstruction acts, enacted over presidential vetoes, put the South under military control. The basic act of March 2, 1867, divided the seceded states, excepting Tennessee, into five military districts, each in command of a major general authorized to perform civil functions necessary to insure complete control of the district. It further provided for the establishment of permanent state governments, based on Negro suffrage (*see* Civil Rights Act, The), but because the existing governments preferred to remain under military

rule rather than to have their affairs controlled and directed by legislative bodies based on Negro suffrage, no move was made to provide for the authorized changes. Consequently, March 23, 1867, Congress passed the first supplementary reconstruction act authorizing the military commanders to provide the machinery for constituting the new governments. They took over the control of registration and voting. The electorate was enlarged and changed in character by the disfranchisement of the former governing class, most of which had served the Southern Confederacy^o, and substitution of the Negro, the Carpetbagger and the Scalawag^o. A second supplementary act was passed July 19, 1867, which interpreted and further extended the powers and duties of the military commanders, particularly in respect to the unlimited right of removal and appointment of state officers. This gave complete control of the personnel of the civil administration to the military commanders. On March 11, 1868, a final supplementary act was enacted providing that the approval of a majority of those voting, regardless of registration, should be regarded as sufficient for ratification of the proposed state constitutions.

The chief aim of these reconstruction acts was political and the result was the creation of class government subject to and supported by the military. In addition the acts were designed to cripple and so handicap Southern business and industry as to eliminate them as effective competitors of Northern business.

[W. E. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic, and Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction*; J. W. Burgess, *Reconstruction and the Constitution, 1866-1876*; J. G. Randall, *Civil War and Reconstruction*; G. F. Milton, *The Age of Hate: Andrew Johnson and the Radicals*; R. S. Henry, *Reconstruction*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Reconstruction and the Churches. Religious bodies in the United States were particularly concerned with public affairs during and following the Civil War. Most of the major Northern churches had entered the South during the war, having won the consent of the War Department to take over church buildings abandoned by Southern ministers. Their refusal to return them to their owners at the close of the war led in some instances to court action and recriminations on the part of the Southern church leaders. The Northern churches generally looked upon the South, at the close of the war, as a new mission field and new organizations were formed to carry on work in the South, especially among the freedmen^o. Numerous Northern ministers found employment in the Freedmen's Bureau^o, some of whom became involved in carpetbag^o and Negro

politics. The great exodus of Southern Negroes from the churches of their former masters and the large influx of Northern Negroes into the South, together with the activity of the Northern white and Negro churches, soon created an entirely new religious situation in the former slave states. The former slaves were gathered into independent congregations all over the South, a great majority being Methodists and Baptists. The Negro's religion at this time, quite naturally, was tinged with politics, and Negro churches were used by unscrupulous carpetbag and Negro politicians to gain control of the Negro ballot. Generally speaking, the Negro ministers were the first recognized leaders of the freedmen and under their direction they took their first steps as American citizens.

[W. W. Sweet, Methodist Church Influence in Southern Politics, in *Miss. Valley Hist. Review*, Vol. I; A. A. Taylor, *The Negro in the Reconstruction of Virginia*; W. W. Sweet, Negro Churches in the South. A Phase of Reconstruction, in *The Methodist Review*, 1921, P. H. Douglas, *Christian Reconstruction in the South*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Following the recession in business which began in July, 1929, the great decline in the prices of commodities, of securities and of real estate left many banks and credit institutions with loans on their books which were good but which temporarily, at least, could not be paid off and certainly did not conform to the eligibility requirements of the Federal Reserve System^{re}. In brief, many solvent banks lacked liquid assets that could be converted into cash without a forced sale. This situation accompanied by panicky fear which seized depositors, leading them to become hoarders, accentuated the difficulties of commercial banks. To meet this emergency the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created by special act of Congress on Jan. 22, 1932. The immediate aim of this corporation was to increase generally the willingness and ability of financial institutions to lend, and the ultimate object was to revive industry by restoring credit.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was also authorized to lend to banks of all kinds, building and loan associations, agricultural credit corporations, mortgage companies, insurance companies, states and their political subdivisions and other public agencies; and, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission^{re}, to aid in the temporary financing of railroads which were unable to obtain funds upon reasonable terms through banking channels or the general public. Railroads were included within the field of activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in recognition of the

dominant position of rail securities among the assets of financial institutions, and of the difficulties that would be incurred in refinancing through public offering the millions of dollars worth of railway bonds, notes and equipment trust issues.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation had a life of ten years beginning Jan. 22, 1932, unless sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It functioned through a principal office in Washington and loan agencies throughout the United States. The Federal Reserve banks acted as its depositories, custodians and fiscal agents. From its inauguration up to the end of 1938, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made 20,000 individual loans to 9000 institutions, aggregating \$4,800,000,000.

[Jesse H. Jones, Reconstruction Finance Corporation *Seven Year Report to the President and the Congress*, February, 1932-February, 1939.]

FRANK PARKER

Recovery, Fort, was built in December, 1793, by a detachment of Gen. Wayne's army under Capt. Alexander Gibson on the site of St. Clair's defeat^{re} of Nov. 4, 1791. One of the soldiers' first duties was to inter the bones of the 600 slain on the field two years earlier. On June 30, 1794, the garrison of 150 men under Maj. William McMahon was subjected to attacks for two days by more than 1000 Indians, apparently under British leadership (this was Wayne's opinion), with Simon Girty conspicuous among them. Twenty-two soldiers were killed and several wounded but the attackers were unable to take the fort (see Wayne Campaign, 1792-95). After this it had little importance except as a supply base and as an important identification point for the Indian boundary delineated in the Treaty of Greenville^{re}.

[E. O. Randall and D. J. Ryan, *History of Ohio*, II; A. A. Graham, *Military Posts in the State of Ohio*, *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society Publications*, III.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Recruiting—of Army and Navy. From the reorganization for peace-time service in 1787 the United States Army^{re}, as distinguished from volunteer^{re} or drafted^{re} troops, has been recruited by voluntary enlistments. Controlled by annual Appropriation Acts of Congress, by army regulations, and, today, by the National Defense Act^{re}, the strength of the army and the numbers of recruits required for it have varied greatly at different periods. Though often augmented after a war by re-enlistments of veterans, ordinarily recruiting proceeds through stations established in heavily populated areas.

For example, in 1832, when the Battalion of Mounted Rangers was expanded into a dragoon regiment, "the additional officers required were transferred from the infantry and scattered over the East to recruit the men."

Even during wars regular army recruiting has continued, at a disadvantage, in competition with volunteer organizations. Thus in a twelve-month period of 1864-65 the Adjutant General reported 19,555 regulars recruited, compared with 202,117 volunteers, drafts and substitutes for the volunteers.

Limitations of authorized strength occasionally force suspension of recruiting. But usually the attritions of service proceed more rapidly than inductions into it. Hence Gen. Winfield Scott's observation in 1849 that "the numbers actually enrolled . . . will always be from a fourth to a third less" than the authorized strength.

The legal limit of the army in 1940 was 220,839; the annual loss from discharges, etc., about 45%. Thus about 99,000 recruits, from 18 to 35 years of age, are required yearly.

Recruiting for the navy is conducted much as for the army but the age limits for applicants are from 17 to 25 years. In 1936 about 20,000 men entered the navy and the same number returned to civilian life.

[Letters from the Army War College and the Adjutant General's Office; Army and Navy recruiting circulars; Oliver L. Spaulding, *The United States Army in War and Peace*; Emory Upton, *Military Policy of the United States*.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Red Cloud War (1866-67) was so called from the Sioux chief who became prominent as its leader. The Sioux fought to prevent use of the Bozeman trail and the maintenance of forts Phil Kearny, C. F. Smith and Reno^{qq}.

The Indians held the forts in a virtual siege and stopped all but armed expeditions on the trail. Destruction of Fetterman's command, Dec. 21, 1866, and the Wagon Box Fight^{qq}, Aug. 2, 1867, were the principal actions. The Government, in 1868, by the Treaty of Fort Laramie^q, abandoned the trail and the forts, ending the war.

[J. P. Dunn, *Massacres of the Mountains*; Cyrus Townsend Brady, *Indian Fights and Fighters*.]

PAUL I. WELLMAN

Red Cross, The American, was organized under the leadership of Clara Barton, May 21, 1881. It immediately undertook relief for victims of natural catastrophes and was actively engaged in relief of sick and wounded in the Spanish-American War.

Reorganized in 1905, it became quasi-governmental through control by a Central Committee

composed of eighteen members: six, including a chairman, appointed by the President, six elected by a Board of Incorporators (dating back to 1881 with vacancies filled by vote of members) and six by Chapter delegates. By custom, representatives of the War, Navy, State, Justice and Treasury departments are named. National headquarters are in Washington with area offices in St. Louis and San Francisco. The local unit is the Chapter, numbering (June 30, 1939) 3716, with 7133 branches. Red Cross work is financed through public contributions, is not and never has been government-financed.

Between the 1905 reorganization and the World War the Red Cross handled relief following the San Francisco earthquake and fire, 1906; Messina, Italy earthquake, 1908; Cherry, Ill., mine explosion, 1909; Mexican border trouble, 1913; Mississippi Valley floods of 1912 and 1916; various other disasters. During this period new Red Cross peacetime services were organized, including first aid and lifesaving, public health nursing, home hygiene courses, etc. During the World War, Red Cross expenditures for home relief were \$119,000,000, in Europe \$154,000,000.

In recent years disaster incidence has become higher; now the organization gives relief to sufferers following about 100 disasters annually. In its greatest relief operation since the World War the Red Cross expended more than \$25,000,000 to aid families affected by the Ohio-Mississippi Valley flood of 1937.

In October, 1939, the American Red Cross appropriated \$1,000,000 to meet immediate war relief needs, concentrating on clothing and medication aids for civilian refugees, impartially administered.

[Mabel T. Boardman, *Under One Red Cross Flag at Home and Abroad*; Ernest P. Bicknell, *Pioneering with the Red Cross and With the Red Cross in Europe, 1917-1922*; Henry P. Davison, *The American Red Cross in the Great War*.]

DOUGLAS GRIESEMER

Red Legs, so called because of their red leggings, were members of a secret military society organized in Kansas in 1862 under command of George W. Hoyt. They numbered from fifty to one hundred; their predatory activities rivaled depredations committed by Missouri guerrillas^q; and they served as Federal scouts in border conflicts.

[L. W. Spring, *Kansas, The Prelude to the War for the Union*.]

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

Red Line Map. Soon after the signature of the preliminary articles of peace and independence with Great Britain in 1782 (*see* Definitive Treaty

of Peace), Benjamin Franklin, as one of the American plenipotentiaries, marked the boundary of the United States, for the reference of Vergennes, French foreign minister, in a "strong red line" on a copy of Mitchell's Map^o of North America, which map has never since been located in the French archives, despite its vital relationship to American boundary disputes, notably the northeast boundary^o. In 1932 a transcript of the map, red line and all, was discovered in the Spanish archives.

[Lawrence Martin and Samuel Flagg Bemis, Franklin's Red-Line Map was a Mitchell, in *The New England Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 5.] SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Red River, Spanish Post on (1691-93). French encroachments into Texas after 1685 aroused the Spaniards to establish missions and military posts there. In 1691 Don Domingo de Teran, governor of Coahuila and Texas, established a post among the Caddo Indians on Red River, near the northwestern corner of modern Louisiana. The post was supplied with cattle and seeds for planting; but the cattle died, the crops failed, the Indians were hostile, the French menace disappeared, and the post was abandoned in 1693.

[H. Yoakum, *History of Texas from Its First Settlement in 1685 to Its Annexation to the United States in 1846*, Vol. I; George P. Garrison, *Texas: A Contest of Civilizations*.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Red River Boundary Dispute. See Greer County Dispute.

Red River Campaign, THE (1864). Early in 1864 Gen. H. W. Halleck (U.) ordered an invasion of the great cotton-growing sections of Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas. The thrust, to be under the command of Gen. N. P. Banks, was to move up the Red River. The advance of the expedition was begun in March to take advantage of the spring rise in the river, which that year did not come.

Banks' command and a force from Mississippi under Gen. A. J. Smith, together with a river fleet, were to converge on Alexandria, La., after which the combined force would move on to a junction with troops under Gen. Frederick Steele coming southward from Arkansas. The two armies would then sweep up the Red River Valley to Shreveport, the Confederate headquarters, and on into eastern Texas. Scattered Confederate troops, of half the Federal strength, under Gen. E. Kirby-Smith, were available to oppose the invasion.

By the middle of March the fleet and Banks' army had taken Fort DeRussy and occupied

Alexandria, there to await the arrival of re-enforcements marching overland from the Mississippi. The retreating Confederate troops under Gen. Richard Taylor, receiving re-enforcements as they retired, halted at Mansfield, La. Posted in good defensive positions, Taylor, on April 8, with less than half his opponents' numbers, sustained Banks' attack. The Federals were defeated and driven back in confusion (see Sabine Cross-Roads, Battle at).

The next day Taylor's troops advanced against Banks' army posted in a strong position at Pleasant Hill^o and in their turn were repulsed. Banks failed to follow up his success. In the night the Federals retreated to Grand Ecore and thence to Alexandria. The withdrawal of the army placed the Federal fleet in jeopardy. On account of continued low water it was uncertain if the ships could pass the rapids at Grand Ecore. However, engineering skill and resourcefulness got them safely through in time to escape capture or destruction.

When the threat of Banks' advance was removed, Kirby-Smith, at Shreveport, undertook both to pursue Banks and to crush Steele. He attacked at Jenkins Ferry^o on April 30. Steele retreated to Little Rock. Kirby-Smith then turned southward to join Taylor for a final blow against Banks. He was too late. Banks had re-embarked and started on his way back to the Mississippi, where the troops were dispersed.

The defeat of Banks' expedition ended important operations in the trans-Mississippi. The Confederate forces held out until May 26, 1865, when Kirby-Smith surrendered, thus ending the war in that area.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. IV.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Red River Cart Traffic. The Red River cart was a two-wheeled vehicle developed from the primitive cart used by Alexander Henry, Jr., at Pembina^o in 1801, which had wheels made from sections of tree trunks, some three feet in diameter. The carts were made entirely of wood and carried a maximum load of 1000 pounds. They were each drawn by an ox or Indian pony with a rude harness of rawhide.

The traffic began as early as 1822 with the founding of Fort Snelling^o. A train of Red River carts a mile in length was not at all infrequent. The carts were loaded at Fort Garry (Winnipeg) or Pembina with buffalo robes, pemmican^o, dried meat and furs. These products were exchanged at Fort Snelling (St. Paul, Minn.) for the trade goods needed at the fur trade posts tributary to Fort Garry. Two trips during the season was the limit since the carts were unable to travel more

than twenty miles a day. In 1843 the American Fur Company⁷⁷ established a post at Pembina under Norman W. Kittson and thereafter the traffic from this point grew rapidly in volume.

The Red River cart trails most used were on the west side of the river, their location being dependent on the season. In the early summer when the tributaries of the Red River were swollen by floods, the trails ran along the western edge of old Lake Agassiz, following the western beach line. In late summer and fall these trails followed closer to the river at a distance depending on the contour of the country. Streams were crossed, where necessary, by the use of hastily improvised rafts. The transport animals swam the streams and were used to pull the rafts across the water. The Red River fords or crossings, as they were called, were well known. The most used of these fords was Graham's Crossing about five miles north of Wahpeton, N. Dak. On the east side of the Red River the trail ran southeast to Fort Snelling. Later the trails crossed the Mississippi River at Sauk Rapids and reached St. Paul on the east side of the river. The Lake Traverse route ran southeast to the crossing of the Minnesota River at Traverse des Sioux and then to Mendota, at its junction with the Mississippi. After 1850 ferries connected Fort Snelling with Mendota and St. Paul.

The low cost of this form of transportation explains its popularity. The oxen and horses were pastured on the prairie grasses and the drivers found abundant game along the entire route. One serious drawback arose from the fact that these trails traversed the area which was the battleground of two Indian tribes, the Chippewa and the Dakotas⁷⁸. This forced the traders to travel in large trains and to be ready to form a corral of the carts to meet either siege or attack anywhere along the route. The trails on the east side of the river were also used to avoid the attacks of the hostile Indians.

Gradually this form of transport gave way to the cheaper form of flatboat and steamboat traffic of the early 1850's, and the coming of the railroad completed the transformation. O. G. LIBBY

Red River Indian War (1874-75). As a result of the Treaty of Medicine Lodge (Barber County, Kans.), in October, 1867, the Comanche,⁷⁹ Kiowa⁸⁰ and Kataka were put on a reservation about the Wichita Mountains, and the Arapaho⁸¹ and Cheyenne⁸² on another farther north (both within western Oklahoma). But the Indians, not content to accept a sedentary life, again and again slipped away to raid the borders of Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico and Texas. During the

summer of 1874 Gen. P. H. Sheridan was ordered to conduct a punitive campaign against the refractory Indians. Soon thereafter both cavalry and infantry under the command of Cols. Nelson A. Miles, George Buell, J. W. Davidson, Ranald S. Mackenzie and Maj. William Price advanced from their posts in Texas, New Mexico and Indian Territory against the hostile Indians who were encamped along the Red River, its tributaries and the canyons of the Staked Plains⁸³. More than fourteen pitched battles were fought before the Indians submitted and returned to their reservations. Seventy-five of their leaders were sent to Florida for confinement. This brought to an end Indian depredations along this part of the frontier.

[C. C. Rister, *The Southwestern Frontier, 1865-1881*; W. S. Nye, *Carbine and Lance*.] C. C. RISTER

Red River of the North, THE, so called to distinguish it from the Red River of the South, forms the boundary between Minnesota and North Dakota and flows through Manitoba into Lake Winnipeg. It was discovered by Pierre Gaultier de la Vérendrye⁸⁴, French explorer and fur trader, in 1733. In that and the ensuing decades, the French built several posts in the Red River country, and by the middle of the century it was the center of profitable fur trade. With the defeat of France in North America in 1763, British fur traders occupied the trans-Red River west and in time it again became the scene of great trade activity. In the 1780's and 1790's it was the battleground of rival Canadian fur traders' organizations; and during the first two decades of the next century the Hudson's Bay and North West companies⁸⁵ waged bitter warfare for its control.

American fur traders did not push into the Red River country until after the War of 1812. The Columbia Fur Company⁸⁶, in 1822, established itself advantageously on Lake Traverse. A half dozen years before this, the American Fur Company⁸⁷ built a post on Red Lake; and in the following decade extended down the river into the Hudson's Bay Company's Winnipeg and Red River districts. In the 1840's American and British traders fought hard for the trade of the country; but it was a losing fight for all fur-trade interests—for by the middle of the century the American farmer was advancing into the region.

The first permanent settlements on the Red River were commenced by Lord Selkirk at "the Forks" and Pembina⁸⁸ in 1812. For many years these were the only real settlements in the country, though many of the fur-trade posts after 1850 became the centers of thriving farming

communities, e.g., Grand Forks. During the decades of the 1870's, 1880's and 1890's thousands of settlers—mostly northern Europeans and eastern Americans—poured into the Red River Valley south of the international boundary. At the same time Canadians were rapidly settling the lower reaches of the river. Before the close of the century, Red River ranked first among the wheat-producing regions of North America.

[John Perry Pritchett, Some Red River Fur Trade Activities, in *Minnesota History Bulletin*, VI; John L. Coulter, Industrial History of the Valley of the Red River of the North, in *Collections of the State Historical Society of North Dakota*, III; William Watts Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*, Vol. I.]

JOHN PERRY PRITCHETT

Red River Raft. An obstruction of logs and other debris, accumulating for many years, had become lodged and fastened together so as to form an almost solid mass which blocked the channel of Red River (of the South) for a distance of 180 miles above Coushatta Bayou, stopping steamboat navigation at Natchitoches, La. About 1830 the War Department complained of the heavy expense of transporting supplies from Natchitoches to Fort Towson⁹⁰ in the Indian country⁹¹, and Congress made an appropriation for removing the raft and improving the navigation of Red River. Capt. Henry Miller Shreve, who had already won a reputation by his success in removing obstructions to navigation on the Ohio and Mississippi, was placed in charge of the work, and between 1833 and 1839 he entirely removed the raft, leaving the river navigable for over 1000 miles. Shreveport, named in honor of the raft-remover, arose as the commercial center of the region thus opened to settlement. After the removal of the original raft, new obstructions formed from time to time at different points in the channel, and Congress made additional appropriations for their removal in almost every decade from 1840 to 1890, when railroads superseded steamboats as the chief transportation agencies in the Red River Valley. The removal of the Red River raft was one of the most important internal improvement projects undertaken by the Federal Government in the ante-bellum Southwest. Total congressional appropriations for that project approximated \$1,000,000, but the value of the lands thus opened to settlement amounted to many times that sum.

[J. Fair Hardin, The First Great Western River Captain: A Sketch of the Career of Captain Henry Miller Shreve, Founder of Shreveport, in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, X; Caroline S. Pfaff, Henry Miller Shreve: A Biography, in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, X.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Red Shirts is the most widely accepted designation of the bands of armed horsemen who overthrew Radical Republican⁹² rule in South Carolina. Beginning in 1870, whites, without official sanction, organized themselves in ununiformed companies for protection against the Negro militia; and as the crucial political campaign of 1876⁹³ got under way they converted white sentiment to a policy of no compromise with the Radicals by bloody work at the Hamburg Riot⁹⁴ of July 8. Within two months of that event the Garibaldian uniform was adopted, and thousands of red-shirted whites rode about encouraging the Wade Hampton canvass for governor, disturbing Radical meetings and terrorizing blacks. There were 290 companies composed of 14,350 men. By intimidation the Red Shirts secured a majority for Hampton in the November election and forced the flight of Radical officeholders when the Federal troops were withdrawn from the state in April, 1877.

[F. B. Simkins and R. H. Woody, *South Carolina during Reconstruction*.]

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS

Redbones, a distinct ethnic group representing a fusion of Indian, Spanish, French and Negro bloods, are so called because of their odd, transparently tinted dusky skins. These people, found in central and southwest Louisiana, generally occupy an intermediate social status, being more privileged than Negroes⁹⁵ but less privileged than whites.

[T. Lynn Smith, The Population of Louisiana: Its Composition and Changes, in *Louisiana Bulletin* No. 293; Ada Jack Carver, Redbone, in *Harper's Magazine*, Vol. CL.]

W. B. HATCHER

Redemptioners were white immigrants who, in return for their passage to America from Europe, sold their services for a period varying from two to seven years. Upon arrival in port, captains of vessels having redemptioners aboard advertised in newspapers the sale of their services to persons who should advance the cost of their passage. From 1681 until after the Revolution, these indentured servants⁹⁶ migrated here primarily to settle after working off their debt. Scarcity of slaves in Pennsylvania created a brisk demand for this type of labor, and farm laborers, skilled craftsmen and domestic servants were included in their lists. Until 1730 this traffic emanated chiefly from England; after that date, the majority were Germans and Scotch-Irish⁹⁷.

[C. A. Herrick, *White Servitude in Pennsylvania*.]

JULIAN P. BOYD

"Reds" is a label used to designate persons who profess the doctrine of violent revolution and

who salute the red flag of Communism and the Third Internationale. It usually refers to alleged extremists of the Left rather than the Right, and for propagandistic reasons is sometimes employed not only to stigmatize Anarchists, Syndicalists and Communists but also Socialists, liberals and progressives.

The symbol came into widespread use in the United States during the years 1918-21. Factors important in causing widespread diffusion at that time were: the opposition of many Socialists⁷ to the World War; the growth of the American labor movement⁸; the activities of the International Workers of the World⁹; the Russian Revolution of November, 1918, and subsequent accounts of developments under Bolshevik rule; the founding of a branch of the Communist party¹⁰ in the United States in 1919; industrial unrest reflected in acts of violence and strikes¹¹; economic difficulties incident to the liquidation of a wartime economy; and a heritage of tensions and fears engendered by the war itself.

During the war the United States Government took strenuous measures to counteract seditious activities. These included the adoption of espionage acts, alien and sedition laws, administrative rulings barring certain publications (such as *The Masses*, the *Milwaukee Leader* and the *New York Call*) from the mails; also judicial decisions curbing freedom of speech, assembly and the press. During the summer of 1918 Eugene V. Debs, Socialist candidate for President, was arrested for a speech made at Canton, Ohio, subsequently convicted of sedition, and sentenced on March 10, 1919, to ten years imprisonment. This action marked the beginning of the "red terror." Altogether some 1500 men and women were convicted under the alien and sedition laws.

On Feb. 4, 1919, a Senate committee was appointed to investigate Bolshevik activities in the United States. On Feb. 11 the Federal Department of Justice brought fifty-three "reds" to Ellis Island for deportation. A nationwide plot to assassinate public officials was uncovered on April 30, and in June of that year U. S. Attorney General Palmer, Mayor Davis of Cleveland and other officials were the victims of bombing plots. From then until April, 1920, the battle between Government and "reds" continued with unabating momentum. On Nov. 7, 1919, the Department of Justice began a nationwide raid on "reds," ultimately resulting in the arrest of more than 6000 persons. On Dec. 21, 1919 some 249 of them were deported for Russia. Fear of "reds" prompted the passage of criminal syndicalist¹² laws by many states, and in January, 1920, the

New York state legislature expelled five members because they were Socialists. (See also Lusk Committee.)

The climax came during the spring of 1920 with the arrest and conviction of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti for killing a paymaster and guard in South Braintree, Mass., on April 15, 1920. The Sacco-Vanzetti case¹³ epitomized the "red terror" at its height. A mysterious dynamite explosion in the New York financial district on Sept. 16, 1920, was alleged to be the work of "reds" but the facts were never established. From time to time Congress conducted special investigations of Communist and subversive¹⁴ activities in the United States, notably in 1930 and in 1938. Various pressure groups, such as the American Legion, the American Liberty League, National Civic Federation, National Security League, Sentinels of the Republic, the American Defense Society, and the Daughters of the American Revolution, persistently emphasized the danger of a "red menace." Prior to 1936 twenty-two states adopted teacher-oath laws designed to curb the spread of "red" doctrines in the schools.

[F. L. Allen, *Only Yesterday, An Informal History of the Nineteen-Twenties*; Zechariah Chafee, Jr., *Freedom of Speech*; A. W. Dunn, *The Reds in America*, in *Review of Reviews*, February, 1920; W. J. Ghent, *The Reds Bring Reaction*.]

HARWOOD L. CHILDS

Redstone Old Fort was the pioneers' name for a mound builders' entrenchment at the confluence of Dunlap's Creek with the Monongahela, in southwestern Pennsylvania. A focus of conflict in the preliminary expeditions of the French and Indian War¹⁵, here in 1759 Col. James Burd of the Pennsylvania militia erected Fort Burd. It served as a refuge from Indian alarms, rallying point for scouts and rangers¹⁶, and depot for military stores, to the close of the Revolutionary War. "Redstone Old Fort" persisted as the common appellation for the fort and for the village of boat builders and traders which grew about it. In 1785 the site passed into private ownership and was rechristened Brownsville.

[James Veech, *The Monongahela of Old*.]

E. DOUGLAS BRANCH

Reed Rules, THE, adopted by the House of Representatives, Feb. 14, 1890, marked the successful conclusion of Speaker Reed's long-continued fight for more efficient procedure in that body. The new rules permitted the suppression of dilatory tactics, substituted a "present" for a "voting" quorum, reduced the size of the Committee of the Whole, and provided sundry changes in the order of business. They brought an immediate increase in efficiency but greatly

increased the power of the Speaker⁹⁹; and the title of "Czar" was promptly bestowed upon their author. A contemporary opponent declared the Speaker and committee chairmen would henceforth constitute "a petty oligarchy with absolute control of the business of the House," and twenty years later the rules were considerably modified in this particular. Many of them, however, proved their worth and are still in effect. (See also Cannonism.)

[William A. Robinson, *Thomas B. Reed, Parliamentarian*; De Alva S. Alexander, *History and Procedure of the House of Representatives*.] W. A. ROBINSON

Reed Treaty (1858). At the end of the Anglo-French War against China (1857-58) the victorious allies imposed peace terms by the treaties of Tientsin which opened up eleven more treaty ports to foreign trade and residence and provided for extraterritorial⁹⁹ protection of foreign nationals traveling and trading throughout all China. The British treaty further stipulated the right of a diplomatic representative to appear at Peking; the toleration of the Christian religion, missionaries and converts; and fixed tariff charges, collected by British officials under Chinese sovereignty at a general level of 5%. William B. Reed, the American minister, simultaneously negotiated a treaty securing for citizens of the United States equality of treatment extended to other foreigners, thus securing the same privileges from China without having participated in hostilities.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*.] SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Referendum. Although usually mentioned in connection with the Initiative⁹⁹, the Referendum is distinguishable from it logically and legally. The Initiative is a means whereby legislation may be passed by popular vote as against a hostile or indifferent legislature; the Referendum is a means whereby measures which have passed the legislature may be defeated by popular vote. Maryland and New Mexico have the Referendum but not the Initiative. With few exceptions state constitutions and amendments thereto are now submitted automatically to the electorate for approval or rejection. America may claim the credit for the invention of this form of constitutional referendum, the first case of its use being the adoption of the constitution of Massachusetts in 1780. More commonly, however, the term referendum is applied to popular votes upon ordinary legislative enactments. This form of the device was imitated in the United States from Swiss models. It was first adopted by South

Dakota in 1898; twenty-one other states have since installed the legislative referendum. Most of these are west of the Mississippi but Maine, Michigan, Ohio, Maryland and Massachusetts are included in the list. In addition, the Referendum applying to municipal ordinances has been incorporated in the charters of many cities, particularly those with commission or city manager⁹⁹ types of government.

Referendum procedure is inaugurated by the circulation of a petition against some measure which has passed the legislature. To be effective, signatures of a certain percentage of the voters must be secured, the requirements ranging from 5% to 10%. Decision by the electorate follows, usually at the first ensuing general election.

Both Referendum and Initiative are vigorously used. In the elections of presidential years the people of the various states possessing these devices of direct popular rule are accustomed to pass upon a total of from 150 to 200 constitutional amendments and legislative acts. Measures dealing with prohibition, public utilities, the direct primary, finances and relief are frequently subjected to popular vote in this way.

[J. D. Barnett, *The Operation of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall in Oregon*.] ROBERT C. BROOKS

Reforestation. Natural reforestation has been most successful in the soft wood areas and where the logging has been done with reforestation in mind. Large quantities of trees frequently grow up from the seed in the ground after logging or even after a fire.

While tree planting for reforestation dates back to the colonial period, successful and systematic action did not develop until the 20th century. The transcontinental railroads made attempts to forest their rights of way in order to prevent snowdrifts, but with little success. Likewise, the attempts under the Timber Culture Act⁹⁹ produced little. In 1905 the Forest Service⁹⁹ began a program of reforestation, but neither the ranger nurseries nor the attempts at reforestation by direct seeding or the planting of trees in the National Forest were successful. Not until 1914, when nearly 10,000 acres were planted (at a cost of about \$10 an acre), was much accomplished.

After the World War, both the National and the state governments began planting programs. The Forest Service established numerous nurseries and began extensive planting, particularly in the Lake states. With the passage in 1924 of the Clarke-McNary Act, which provided for subsidies from the Federal Government for the establishment of nurseries and the planting of

trees, the states became interested. In 1929 the State of New York passed a reforestation amendment providing for \$20,000,000 to be used by the State Reforestation Commission to purchase and reforest several million acres of abandoned farm land. Withal, however, reforestation in relation to the need, prior to 1933, was insignificant. Between 1911 and 1932 nearly 4,500,000 acres of cut-over land had been added to the National Forest system, but little was done in reforesting.

The establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps⁹⁹, in 1933, and additional allotments of funds, made possible a comprehensive program. The Forest Service nurseries were enlarged and new ones added. These nurseries have an annual production of about 100,000,000 trees which should reforest about 100,000 acres. Likewise, the states have been spurred to new interest. The state nurseries have contributed to the Civilian Conservation Corps more than 12,000,000 trees, and, under the Clarke-McNary Act, in one year, distributed over 22,000,000 trees to be planted as windbreaks and shelter belts, and for the prevention of erosion.

[N. C. Brown, *General Forestry*; A. N. Pack, *Forestry, An Economic Challenge*.]

JOHN T. GANOE

Reform ("re-form"), like evolution, really means change though both words have popularly come to connote change for the better, in spite of the fact that both science and history show that this is not necessarily the case. In nature a higher form may "evolve" into a lower, and social "reform" may leave conditions worse instead of better and have many unexpected results. In the experimental and rapid development of the United States, changes have been equally rapid, and consequently the number of movements dubbed reform have been especially numerous. Many of these have been characterized by fanaticism, the overriding of minority rights⁹⁹, and narrow-mindedness on the part of the reformers who have been willing to sacrifice all else to attain their one end. Many good reforms have been carried out but frequently the word has been used to cloak the desire of a minority to effect change in the direction of their peculiar ideas.

It is impossible to mention all the reform movements in our history but in the following list we may find examples of types, motives and results.

We may consider the first "reform" to have been inaugurated seven years after the founding of Jamestown⁹⁹ when the disastrous communal work and property system was replaced by that

of private property. Religious and social "reforms" were effected in Plymouth⁹⁹ when the Pilgrims refused to allow games to be played on Christmas or a May Pole used on May Day. From these the list is long and varied, including such episodes as the persecution of the Baptists and Quakers⁹⁹ in Massachusetts Bay. Another, forced on that colony by England, was the disallowance of church membership as a test for the franchise. In the Jeffersonian period (*see* Jeffersonian Democracy) greater democracy was enthroned, and political power transferred from "the wise, and good and rich"⁹⁹ of the Federalist ideal. This was carried farther in the Jacksonian democracy⁹⁹, when, manhood suffrage having been generally attained, the "people" and the West came into control in Washington. Other suffrage reforms have been embodied in such amendments to the Constitution as the Fifteenth (equal rights regardless of race, etc.), the Nineteenth (women's suffrage), or the Seventeenth (popular election of senators)⁹⁹. Among other political "reform" movements may be mentioned experiments with the initiative, referendum and recall⁹⁹, and Theodore Roosevelt's suggested recall of judicial decisions, as well as secret balloting.

The Abolitionist movement⁹⁹, with its slogan that the Constitution was "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," well illustrates some of the aspects of many of our reforms, as did the attempt by the New Deal to control the Supreme Court in order to take a short cut to its proposed reforms (*see* Supreme Court Packing Bills). The experiment with Prohibition after nearly a century of the temperance movement, and the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment by the Twenty-first⁹⁹, illustrate another phase of reform movements by the retracing of our steps.

Scarcely a single department of our life has not had its reformers and movements, many of great value. Among these may be cited the reforms in conditions of labor, especially from the 1830's; the abandonment of imprisonment for debt, though not yet total; the treatment of the insane, poor and prisoners, stemming largely from the efforts of Dorothea Dix in the 1840's; educational improvement, beginning with Horace Mann about the same time, these decades having been perhaps the leading reform period in our history⁹⁹. The last movement illustrates again what we began by saying, for in its latest phases, especially Progressive Education, many question whether it is an improvement.

Other reform movements have been that in woman's dress, started by Amelia J. Bloomer in the 1850's; that in the Civil Service, largely dating from the 1880's; and the many local move-

ments for municipal reform, including experiments with new types of government, such as City Manager, etc.²⁹⁷. More recently there have been efforts at various economic reforms, such as control of corporations, the Stock Exchanges, issuance of securities, and so on in innumerable fields. A current movement, which, like the educational one, is a subject of heated controversy, is that demanding complete equality of the sexes and the abolition of all laws designed to favor women. The depression since 1929 inaugurated another marked period of "reform," though in many cases it is too soon to say whether many of the laws have represented improvement or mere change, and the reiteration of our having to choose between "recovery and reform" throws yet another light on the latter as understood in America.

[A. M. Schlesinger and D. R. Fox, eds., *A History of American Life*, by various authors.]

JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS

Reformatories. Public interest in the rehabilitation of the criminal first began seriously to manifest itself at the beginning of the 19th century. However, as it was still difficult to arouse sympathy in the reformation of adults, attention was confined to juvenile delinquents. The first reformatory for children in the United States, the New York House of Refuge, was built in 1825. Boston followed in 1826 with a House of Reformation, and Philadelphia in 1828 also founded a House of Refuge. These institutions were supported by private capital, and it was not until 1847, when Massachusetts established a juvenile reformatory, that the movement toward state maintenance and supervision began. At first these reformatories attempted to rehabilitate the offender by means of education, work and healthful surroundings; but the system gradually acquired the repressive qualities of a prison, retaining prisonlike characteristics until the turn of the century. Today such institutions are conducted in the main as industrial and trade schools, and are no longer called reformatories. Practically all are now state maintained.

The first American reformatory for adults, the Elmira Reformatory, was opened in 1874 under the supervision of Zebulon Brockway, who induced the New York legislature to permit indeterminate sentences providing for the release of inmates before the expiration of their maximum terms if their behavior warranted it. Elmira admitted only convicted men between the ages of sixteen and thirty, who had not been previously convicted of a felony. Most states now have similar adult reformatories, confined to first felony offenders. The greater number today (1939) are

conducted on prison principles, with strict discipline and complete regimentation. Although classification, psychiatry and other scientific attempts toward moral reconstruction have been utilized in recent years, actual reform of a rehabilitative character is still in doubt.

Outside of New York State, no adult women's reformatories were established until 1900. Since then the movement has extended itself, and most states now have these institutions. They are, as a rule, devoted to misdemeanants as well as felons.

[Z. R. Brockway, *Fifty-two Years of Prison Service*; H. E. Barnes, *The Repression of Crime*; F. H. Wines, *Punishment and Reformation*; Philip Parsons, *Crime and the Criminal*; Lewis E. Lawes, *Twenty Thousand Years in Sing Sing*, and *Invisible Stripes*.]

LEWIS E. LAWES

Reformed Church in America, THE, is known informally as the Dutch Reformed Church. Its first congregation was organized in New Amsterdam, 1628. Colonists from the Netherlands and France, occupying the river valleys of New York and New Jersey, established congregations which for many years were the prevailing religious organizations in those areas. Until late in the 18th century they were subordinate to the classis or synod of the Reformed Church of Holland, their American independence being about coincident with the independence of the colonies. The growth of the church has been in New York, New Jersey, Michigan and adjacent states. The name of the church was changed from Reformed Protestant Dutch Church to Reformed Church in America, 1867-69. It now numbers 160,000 members.

[David D. Demarest, *Reformed Church in America*.]

W. H. S. DEMAREST

Refrigeration. Knowledge of the preservative qualities of ice and its use as a refrigerant is not only a European heritage, but was practised under primitive conditions by the Indian inhabitants of this country and passed on to the colonists. From both of these sources has developed an ice and refrigeration industry which, while drawing greatly from European experiments, is now another industry in which the United States leads the world in new developments.

Methods practised by the Indians and adapted to frontier life by the colonists included the use of springs and caves. In the arid Southwest, cooling by evaporation in earthenware jars or in shallow trays was effective. Deep wells and storage cellars are still in use. More permanent settlements made use of ice cut in the winter from frozen ponds and streams and stored in insulated ice houses for use in warmer seasons.

The northern part of the country had an abundant supply of natural ice for which there was a constant market in the Southern colonies and in the West Indies. In 1799 is recorded the first shipment of ice from New York to Charleston, S. C., and from thence to the West Indies. Frederick Tudor in 1805 entered into the ice trade, getting ice from a pond near Lynn, Mass., and making shipments to the East and West Indies, South America and India. An ice warehouse was built by him in 1820 at New Orleans. The dependence of the South on ice from distant sources was an incentive to the development of mechanical refrigeration in that section. From 1836 on, extensive experiments were conducted, and in 1846 the first ice-making plant in America was built at Shreveport, La. The year 1879 marks the apex of the natural ice-producing industry. With the great natural ice shortage in 1890, efforts to produce ice by mechanical means were greatly stimulated.

The principle that gases, when passing from a liquid to a gaseous state, absorb heat, underlies the experiments in modern refrigeration. As early as 1755 Dr. Cullen of Scotland was able to produce cold mechanically by evaporating water in a vacuum. Experiments with other liquids followed; sulphuric acid, ether and ammonia are some of the solvents used. Jacob Perkins, a Massachusetts mechanic and engineer, working in London in 1834 invented an ether machine which, after further development by other inventors, became a practical machine, and commercial quantities of ice were produced in 1855.

To Dr. John Garrie of Florida, working in New Orleans in 1845, is attributed the cold-air machine. In 1850 came the ammonia absorption process invented by Carré of France. Linde of Germany introduced the ammonia compression machine in 1875. The two latter processes are basic to the two forms of household refrigeration now in use, the compression system and absorption system, both of which are electrically driven.

In 1856 Prof. Benjamin Nyce of Indiana used natural ice in an insulated cold-storage house for fruit. He took out the first patent for such houses in 1858. Mechanical refrigeration was first applied to the cold storage of fruits in large cities in 1878. The Pictet Artificial Ice Company in New York City was the first establishment to use mechanical refrigeration for this purpose in 1881. By 1890 the system of shipment and storage under refrigeration was present in all essential characteristics.

The refrigerator car was developed during this same period. The first insulated car for the shipment of meats and dairy products was pro-

duced by W. W. Chandler in 1857. J. B. Sutherland of Detroit patented the first refrigerator car in 1867. An improved car which could be refilled with ice in transit was patented by D. W. Davis of Detroit in 1868. A major improvement was effected in 1887 when Parker Earle of Cobden, Ill., and F. A. Thomas of Chicago formed a partnership to operate a through-service on refrigerator cars, providing for their re-icing in transit.

In 1869 dressed beef was successfully shipped from Chicago to New York. This meant that New York consumers of western meat would no longer have to rely on cuts from emaciated live animals. The availability of artificial ice in transit, at shipping points and in the market in cold-storage houses, has revolutionized those industries engaged in the production and distribution of perishables, widening their markets, lowering their costs, and bringing to the consumer a variety of foods before undreamed of.

The principle of refrigeration has found new application in the quick-freezing processes, first in the fishing industry, which it greatly aided by preparing a highly perishable product for a wide market; and afterwards in the preservation of fruits, vegetables, meats and dairy products. Quick freezing is accomplished at temperatures of -45° to -50° F. The theory behind this type of freezing is that it prevents the forming of large ice crystals which tear the tissues and release the juices of meat and fish when freezing takes place over longer periods of time.

Solid carbon dioxide or dry ice found practical application in the ice-cream industry in 1924. Though expensive, it is a highly efficient refrigerant and is especially adapted for use in refrigerator trucks on the highway.

The refrigeration principle is used in the manufacture of rayon and silk, in the steel mill, in making movie film, in the brewing industry, in the storage of furs, and in air conditioning^o.

[Justus C. Goosmann, *History of Refrigeration*, in *Ice and Refrigeration*, April-July, 1924; James A. Moyer and Raymond V. Fritz, *Refrigeration*; Bernard H. Springett, *Cold Storage and Ice Making*; E. A. Duddy and D. A. Revzan, *Physical Distribution of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables*; W. A. Taylor, *The Influence of Refrigeration on the Fruit Industry*, in *U. S. Department of Agriculture Year Book*, 1900.]

EDWARD A. DUDDY

Refugee Tract, THE (Act of Feb. 18, 1801), consisted of the fractional townships of the public domain^o, Ranges XVI-XXII inclusive (see *Public Lands*, Survey of), just below the U. S. Military Tract^o. This narrow strip of 103,527 acres extending forty-two miles eastward from the Scioto River at Columbus, Ohio, was set aside

for Canadians who had aided the American cause during the Revolution and had become refugees. By various acts 58,080 acres were granted to sixty-seven claimants, the rest of the tract being thrown open to public sale.

[W. E. Peters, *Ohio Lands and Their History*.]

EUGENE H. ROSEBOOM

Regicides in New England, THE. When the members of the High Court of Justice which condemned Charles I were exempted from amnesty at the Restoration, three, variously called the Colonels, the Judges, or the Regicides, escaped to New England. Edward Whalley, an own cousin of Oliver Cromwell, and William Goffe, Whalley's son-in-law, arrived in Boston on July 26, 1660. After a sojourn with Maj. Daniel Gookin in Cambridge, safety required them to move to New Haven in March, 1661, where they were sheltered by the Rev. John Davenport and his neighbor, William Jones. In May, agents in pursuit of them were cleverly delayed and thrown off the scent by Gov. Leete and the other magistrates. Meanwhile Whalley and Goffe made their escape and seem to have lived for some time in what is still known as "the Judges' cave" on West Rock, near New Haven, receiving succor from a near-by farmer, Richard Sperry.

From June, 1661, they lived at Milford with Micah, or Michael, Tomkins. As circumstances rendered their further stay dangerous, they took refuge with the Rev. John Russell at Hadley, Mass., in October, 1664. Whalley appears to have died there late in 1674 or early in 1675. During King Philip's War^W Hadley was one of the centers of military operations and, when attacked one day, a strange and venerable person, presumably Goffe, suddenly appeared and assumed leadership of the defenders and as promptly disappeared. Since further residence there seemed too perilous, Goffe moved to Hartford not later than September, 1676, where he lived with Capt. Thomas Bull or his son, Jonathan, perhaps until his death in the latter part of 1679, though he may have spent his last days at either New Haven or Hadley.

The third regicide to seek refuge in New England was John Dixwell who had had a distinguished but less prominent career in England and whose life in New England was less romantic. He had escaped to Germany in 1660 and appeared at Hadley in February, 1665. The next record of him is at New Haven in 1673 under the name of James Davids. There he was twice married and lived quietly until his death on March 18, 1689. His grave is still pointed out in the rear of Center Church.

Registration of Voters

During their residence in New England all three of the judges maintained correspondence with their relatives in England through the Rev. Increase Mather of Boston.

[Lemuel A. Welles, *The History of the Regicides in New England*.]

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

Regional Planning has developed in two ways. Cities discovered that municipal planning alone was inadequate—that the development of a city could be guided effectively only in relation to the metropolitan area^W or region of which it was the center. Conversely, attempts to think in terms of national and state planning led early to a consideration of the problems of the various regional areas. The National Resources Board, established in 1933 (later, the National Resources Committee), encouraged the setting up of state planning boards, and then turned to regional areas, first in general, then in particular sections, as New England, the Pacific Northwest, etc. Most significant, perhaps, is the Tennessee Valley Authority^W. These developments gave rise, in turn, to several proposals for the extension of the T.V.A.—regional planning idea to the entire country, through a series of zones or regions. Quite independently, the states have, through such agencies of interstate co-operation as the Port of New York Authority, the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, the Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin and the Interstate Commission on the Ohio River Basin, concerned themselves with regional planning.

[James W. Fesler, *Federal Administrative Regions*, in *American Political Science Review*, April, 1936, W. Brooke Graves, *The Future of the American States*, *ibid.*, February, 1936; Clarence L. Hodge, *The Tennessee Valley Authority: A National Experiment in Regionalism*; Charles E. Merriam and Albert Lepawsky, *The Government of Metropolitan Chicago*; H. E. Moore, *What Is Regionalism?* in *Southern Policy Papers*, No. 10; National Resources Committee, *Regional Factors in National Planning*, *Regional Planning: Pacific Northwest*, and other studies; Howard W. Odum, *Regionalism v. Sectionalism in the South's Place in the National Economy*, in *Social Forces*, March, 1934, *Southern Regions*; Port of New York Authority and other similar agencies, annual reports; Thomas J. Woofter, Jr., *The Tennessee Valley Regional Plan*, in *Social Forces*, March, 1934, and *The Subregions of the Southeast*, *ibid.*, October, 1934; Odum and Moore, *American Regionalism*; *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *Intergovernmental Relations in the United States*, Part III, January, 1940.]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Registration of Voters prior to elections has been adopted in most states as the result of grave election frauds, such as voting by "repeaters" under fictitious names, or the names of persons

who have died or moved from the precinct. Prior to the requirement of registration, election frauds and violence at the polls were very common in American cities.

The first registration law was enacted by Massachusetts in 1800. It provided that the assessors should compile a list of qualified electors, which was posted and revised before election day. Other New England states soon followed the lead of Massachusetts, but elsewhere legislation was delayed. New York did not enact such a law until 1840. It was repealed two years later and was not re-enacted until 1859. Most states with large cities adopted registration laws between 1850 and 1900, but many of them were essentially defective and failed to curb election frauds. However, there has been a general trend toward tightening and extending these laws. Only Texas and Arkansas do not require registration, and in these states the lists of poll-tax payers are used at the polls as a registration list. In many states, however, registration is required only in cities.

Many of the older laws did not require the voter to register personally, permitting registration officials to list the names of all persons whom they believed to be qualified. Such lists commonly contained names of persons who had died or moved away, and thus afforded little protection. Personal application is now generally required. Many states formerly permitted unregistered electors to "swear in" their votes at the polls, a provision now discontinued except in a few states where court decisions have required it. Formerly registration laws provided for a new general registration of all voters annually, or every two or four years. Periodic registration laws have given way in many states to permanent registration, under which the voter does not renew his registration while continuing to reside at the same address. Under most such systems the voter is required to sign his registration record, and his signature is required at the polls for identification; in large cities there is a house-to-house check by police or election officials; and if the voter fails to vote for a specified period (usually two years), his name is dropped from the list.

[Joseph P. Harris, *Registration of Voters in the United States*; A Model Registration System, in *National Municipal Review*, Vol. XVI.] JOSEPH P. HARRIS

Regulating Act, THE. See Massachusetts Government Act.

Regulation. See Business, Public Control of; Congress, The Regulatory Powers of; Public Utilities, Regulation of.

Regulators were irregular armed combinations, organized in numerous Southern communities after the Civil War, to obstruct the welfare activities of the Freedmen's Bureau⁷⁰. These local self-appointed committees of vigilantes, known also as "Black-Horse Cavalry" and "Jayhawkers" in Georgia and Louisiana, generally rode at night, in disguise, employing arson, murder and mutilation to terrorize the freedmen and prevent the exercise of their rights to make labor contracts and to migrate. The Regulators resembled the Ku Klux Klan⁷¹ of two years later in the methods employed, but they lacked the hierarchical organization and the political aims of the Klan.

[Reports of the Assistant Commissioners of Freedmen, Oct. 1866, *Sen. Exec. Doc. No. 6*, 39 Cong., 2 Sess., *The Nation*, 1866.] MARTIN P. CLAUSSEN

Regulators of North Carolina, THE (1764-71). A long struggle of the settlers in the then back counties of North Carolina against the oppressive administration of the laws by corrupt officials, and excessive fees charged by them and by attorneys, began (1764) in Anson, Orange and Granville counties. Serious disturbances led to the issuance by Gov. Arthur Dobbs of a proclamation forbidding the taking of illegal fees. This for a time measurably allayed the discontent. Not until the spring of 1768 was there any further organized resistance to the official class. The protestants then organized what they termed "The Regulation," the center being Orange County. The new governor, William Tryon, was in the western counties in July and August, 1768, and assembled at Hillsborough a body of militia to suppress a threatened uprising and protect the courts. Before this show of force the Regulators wilted and agitation subsided.

The second phase of the regulation covered the years 1769-71. Suits brought against extorting officials failing to afford adequate relief, the movement took the form of driving local justices from the bench and threatening the officials of the courts with violence. At the September, 1770, session of the superior court at Hillsborough the Regulators presented a petition to the presiding judge, Richard Henderson, demanding unprejudiced juries and a public accounting of taxes by sheriffs, which concluded, "Though there are a few men who have the gift and art of reasoning, yet every man has a feeling and knows when he has justice done him, as well as the most learned." The court had hardly convened when 150 Regulators, equipped with sticks, switches and cudgels, crowded into the courtroom and insisted that

one of their number be permitted to speak. Jeremiah Fields, in their behalf, demanded that their cases, based on extortion, be tried at that term and by jurors newly chosen. A leading lawyer, John Williams, starting into the courthouse, was given a severe thrashing. Peaceful methods cast aside, the crowd rushed upon Edmund Fanning who was, in their eyes, their chief oppressor, and he, with three others, was whipped. Fanning's house was looted and demolished. Judge Henderson had promised to comply with the demands the following day, but at night he mounted his horse and rode away to his home in Granville County. The November following, Henderson's home, barn and stables went up in flames.

Gov. Tryon ordered the arrest of the leaders concerned in these outbreaks. Energetic preparations were made for a military expedition to Orange County, and there resulted the battle of Alamance⁷⁰. A large majority of North Carolina historians vindicate the Regulators.

[*N. Car. Records*, Vols. VII, VIII, XXII; John S. Bassett, *The Regulators of North Carolina*, in *American Historical Asso. Report*, 1894.] SAMUEL C. WILLIAMS

Regulators of South Carolina, THE (1767-69), were irregular and sporadic organizations of back-country settlers formed for the purpose of breaking up the bands of horse thieves and their accomplices which had established a reign of terror in the new settlements. Proceeding with efficiency but with self-restraint they purged the country of the vicious and lawless. The lack of courts in the interior of the province, the cause of the evil, was corrected by the assembly and the movement came to an end.

[Edward McCrady *History of South Carolina under the Royal Government*.] R. L. MERIWETHER

Relief. The depression following 1929 found American social welfare work (*see* Pauperism and Poverty) in a period of rapid improvement in quality and organization, but by no means prepared to handle the vastly increased quantity of the burden placed upon it. Unemployment⁷¹ rose from about 2,000,000 in 1929 to about 14,000,000 in March, 1933. It became clearer than ever before that the personal incompetence and laziness often found among dependents, and the deficiencies of job-placement machinery, were a mere bagatelle as compared with the effects of the business cycle⁷² and its periodic stalling of industry.

Under the Hoover administration, from 1930 to 1933, local government and private efforts were intensified. Total 1931 relief in cities was

four times as great as that of 1929, with private agencies maintaining their proportionate share (about one fourth of the total). Citizens' Emergency Committees arose in many communities in 1930 to carry on united drives for private funds and to co-ordinate local agencies. Some 200 communities included work relief; in other words, jobs were created through the setting up of various small "work projects" by local government bodies and non-profit institutions, using mainly hand labor, and accomplishing work which had some public utility but would not otherwise have been undertaken at that time. In 1931 President Hoover created a National Committee on Unemployment Relief. In 1932 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation⁷³ was set up to make emergency loans to Federal, state and local governmental bodies and to private business, including railways and banks, on the theory that these loans would enable work and production to continue and would thus check the increase of unemployment. The R.F.C. also lent some \$300,000,000 to the states for the purpose of direct relief of the unemployed. Beginning in September, 1931, with New York State, the states themselves set up "emergency relief administrations" through which they began pouring state money, gained from bond issues or new taxes, into the failing local relief funds. In so doing the state governments took increasing control over local relief work, in general raising its standards and making it more uniform.

These measures proved inadequate to stem the tide of increasing depression and unemployment. Their inadequacy accounted in large part for the Democratic landslide of 1932 and the election of F. D. Roosevelt.

Under Roosevelt in 1933, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration⁷⁴ was created, and through it \$1,000,000,000 distributed as grants-in-aid to the states for both work and home relief. The Civilian Conservation Corps⁷⁵ was created, employing from 250,000 to 500,000 young men, mostly from relief families, in conservation work. The Civil Works Administration⁷⁶, operating for four months beginning in November, 1933, gave work relief to some 4,000,000 unemployed during the worst winter of the depression at a total cost of almost \$1,000,000,000. In 1934 the Federal Government returned to the grant-in-aid program of the F.E.R.A. In 1935 it decided to leave home relief entirely to the states, while it assumed the whole burden of work relief through the Works Progress Administration⁷⁷. While great effort was made to give W.P.A. work the dignity of regular employment and to separate it from the concept of "relief," and while

many pieces of work of great social value were achieved by it, nevertheless it incurred much public contempt. Its administration, entirely by Federal machinery extending down to the local communities, provided many positions which could be filled according to the spoils system. In some places it was charged that the organization was used to influence elections. These conditions helped to give rise to the Hatch Law⁷⁰ of 1939, forbidding political activity to Federal employees. In some cities W.P.A. workers became organized and engaged in labor disputes.

The W.P.A. employed, altogether, about 3,000,000 at any given time, the number fluctuating with economic and political conditions. It included many projects for unemployed white-collar workers, such as the Federal Theater Project.

The National Youth Administration⁷¹ was created in 1935 within the W.P.A. to provide a special program for persons of sixteen to twenty-four years of age inclusive. This included jobs, counselling and placement services, and assistance to students.

The Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works⁷² (F.W.A.) was also created in 1933, to make employment by promoting the construction of sound and useful projects. Under these F.W.A. projects workmen were hired in the open market, usually by construction companies, without regard to their need, and were paid current wages. The projects in general were larger and involved more advance planning than the W.P.A. projects.

The Social Security Act of 1935⁷³ inaugurated a new national program whose general tendency was to substitute social insurance and categorical relief on a permanent basis for the emergency and general relief of the depression period. Thus persons losing their jobs were to be taken care of for a certain time by unemployment compensation before they had to apply for relief, with the investigation of need which this involved. Persons over sixty-five came to be taken care of increasingly through state old-age assistance⁷⁴, administered through the local welfare officers, and subsidized by the Federal Government. The intent was that, as time went on, the aged would be increasingly cared for by Federal old-age insurance benefits which would come to them automatically in return for the taxes they and their employers paid, and not as relief based upon need.

The assistance of the Federal Government in these many ways carried with it a greater degree of state and Federal subdivision, and higher and more uniform standards of work by the local

welfare authorities. "Emergency" relief bureaus were abolished, and many specialized local authorities were consolidated into county and city welfare departments handling many or all forms of relief. Thus, as an outgrowth of the depression the United States acquired for the first time what might be called a national system of public welfare, instead of a miscellany of disconnected local measures.

There were also several special forms of aid to farmers and rural people, such as that under the Resettlement Administration⁷⁵.

In 1933 the total expenditure in the United States for public assistance of all types, plus earnings under Federal work programs, was about \$1,000,000,000, of which the major part was general relief. By 1939 the picture had changed; about \$3,500,000,000 per year was being spent. Almost half of this was for work relief under the W.P.A. The remainder was divided, with a very rough equality, between (1) other Federal projects, (2) general relief by states and local communities, and (3) special types of public assistance, the latter including categorical relief subsidized by the Social Security set-up.

[*A Brief Explanation of the Social Security Act*, Circular No. 1, 1938; James H. S. Bossard, *Social Change and Social Problems*, George B. Mangold, *Organization for Social Welfare*; New York State Department of Social Welfare, *Public Assistance Manual*, 1938, *Recent Social Trends*, 1933; *Social Security Bulletin*, monthly; *Social Work Year Book*, 1939; *United States Government Manual*, 1938.]

JOSEPH K. FOLSOM

Relief Act of 1821. Between 1806 and 1820 fully a dozen acts were passed granting extensions of time to settlers who either could not, or deliberately did not, complete the payments on public land⁷⁶ purchased by them under the credit system laid down in the Harrison Land Law of 1800⁷⁷. When the credit system was abolished by the Land Act of 1820⁷⁸, delinquent land purchasers owed the Government more than \$21,000,000. In order to aid settlers in completing their payments, Congress passed another relief act, dated March 2, 1821, remitting accrued interest, offering a liberal discount for prompt payment, granting a further extension of time, or permitting purchasers to cancel their debt by relinquishing a portion of their land.

[Benjamin H. Hibbard, *A History of the Public Land Policies*.]

DAN E. CLARK

Religion, American. Protestantism from northern Europe, especially from England and Scotland, supplied the main stream of American religion. Under the liberalizing influence of the frontier⁷⁹, this Protestantism showed two major

tendencies: the growth of religious liberty⁹⁹ leading to voluntarism and the multiplication of sects; the breakdown of Calvinistic theology and the development of characteristically American doctrines of social Christianity.

Early New England Calvinism pictured all men sinners before an angry sovereign God of unbending will. Salvation of souls was the primary religious object. Only the elect were saved, and that by unremitting vigilance. The theocracy⁹⁹ which mirrored this theology dominated New England society until its radical supernaturalism exploded in the Salem witch hunt (1692). The Narragansett Bay settlements and the New Haven settlement⁹⁹ were effective protests against the rigidity of the system, but probably its most important consequence was the marked religious apathy of the late 17th and early 18th centuries. The early zeal for Christianizing the Indians had waned, and not more than 4% or 5% of the white population belonged to the churches, which scarcely touched the life of the common people, even after the adoption of the liberalizing Halfway Covenant⁹⁹. The Great Awakening⁹⁹ of the 18th century brought more liberal doctrines of church membership⁹⁹ and salvation, but left the mass of population still unchurched. The enthusiasm of the Awakening yielded somewhat to the rationalism, often approaching deism⁹⁹, of the Revolutionary period.

Independence brought problems of national religious organization. Ecclesiastical independence, achieved by all the principal denominations during the decade following the Revolution, swelled the growing tide of American nationalism, and the process of church constitution making was strikingly parallel to the political constitution making of the period. The Great Revival (1801) and the manifest religious needs of the frontier produced a vigorous home missionary movement, beginning with the Plan of Union (1801) and the American Home Missionary Society (1826)⁹⁹, which increased church membership from 365,000 (1800) to 3,530,000 (1850), more than twice the rate of population increase. Home missionary activity, combined with frontier resentment against religious control by older settled regions, brought a rapid multiplication of denominations by schism, by importation from Europe, and by the birth of new sects. The antidenominationalism of the Disciples was one natural reaction, as was their desire, shared with the Mormons⁹⁹, to restore primitive Christianity. Unitarianism and Universalism⁹⁹, which had slight pre-Revolutionary beginnings, took form during this period. Shakers moved into the West; Millerism (1831) and

Spiritualism⁹⁹ (1847) made their appearance. Schisms split Methodists, Baptists and Presbyterians⁹⁹ into numerous sects. Religious enthusiasm found expression in the almost universal camp meeting⁹⁹, a by-product of frontier revivalism. Poorly trained and highly emotional frontier preachers of the type of Lorenzo Dow inflamed the religious impulses of their audiences, producing queer physical manifestations, such as the "jerks" and fainting fits. Religious enthusiasm lent service to politics after the advent of Jacksonian Democracy⁹⁹ when politicians began to exploit the value of church membership.

Unitarianism replaced the belief in man's evil character with a belief in his goodness, paving the way for ideas of progress and perfectionism in Christianity. Universalists preached a God too good to condemn man to punishment. Early in the 19th century modified ideas of this sort spread through American Protestantism, leading the church to attack problems of prison reform, temperance, prostitution and slavery, and brought experiments in religious communism such as the Rappites, the Oneida Community and Brook Farm⁹⁹. A strong sense of the social implications of Christianity was to become an outstanding characteristic of American religion, its development paralleling closely the evolution of democratic ideas and practice.

The slavery controversy and the Civil War (see Slavery, Attitude of the Churches to) brought a sectional schism in the principal denominations. After the war the churches, for a time, lost much of their interest in reform⁹⁹. Lay religious leadership was asserted by revivalists like Dwight L. Moody, and in organizations like the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A.⁹⁹. Immigration during this period brought Roman Catholics in greater numbers, and Catholicism⁹⁹ began an expansion which gave it, by 1936, a membership of 20,831,139, twice that of the largest Protestant group (Baptists). Catholicism was particularly successful among urban workingmen. The United States remained a Protestant nation, but much less exclusively so.

The end of the century brought momentous changes. Darwinian evolution⁹⁹ and historical geology added to the growing current of materialistic and pragmatic thinking brought by the Industrial Revolution. Physiological psychology reduced religious experience to the level of other mental phenomena. "Higher criticism"⁹⁹ impugned the inspiration of the scriptures. Loyalty to secular movements supplanted religious faith in many persons. Paradoxically, while church membership continued to increase steadily from year to year, free thinking and religious

indifference became common, especially among the educated classes, and church attendance fell off. The Puritan Sabbath and Puritan morality gave way markedly after 1900. Liberal Christians accepted the new views of the Bible²⁰, and accepted the new science, making its laws part of a Divine plan. Improvement of the individual and the social order by means of the new science and sociology displaced interest in otherworldly religion, particularly after the World War. A religious spirit animated the movements for social reform. "Fundamentalists"²¹ waged a losing war against science and the new theology. A wave of laws prohibiting the teaching of evolution reached its climax in the Scopes trial²² in Tennessee (1925). Christian Science²³ came (1882) as an early revolt against materialism and science. Postwar religious humanism brought a counteracting religious mysticism, partly German in origin, expressed in Buchmanism and other new sects.

New sects have appeared most frequently among the poor and underprivileged. Becoming respectable with age, they are replaced by others. By 1936 there were more than 200 separate religious denominations in the United States, and small sects, usually with Pentecostal and millenarian tendencies, were still growing rapidly. Denominations under 50,000 grew 29.49% (1931-36), as compared with 1.1% for those over 50,000.

The need for interdenominational co-operation in missions helped to bring closer Protestant union, made feasible by the disappearance of denominational theological differences in the new theology. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America²⁴ was organized in 1908. American religious leaders were prominent in a series of ecumenical conferences culminating in the meetings at Oxford and Edinburgh (1937) devising a broader program of Christian union.

[L. W. Bacon, *History of American Christianity*; E. T. Clark, *The Small Sects in America*; H. R. Niebuhr, *Social Sources of Denominationalism*; H. K. Rowe, *History of Religion in the United States*; W. W. Sweet, *Story of Religions in America*.]

HAROLD E. DAVIS

Religion and Politics. Religion has often been a factor in drawing American party lines. John Adams claimed that opposition to Anglicanism²⁵ was important in forming the Revolutionary party, while prominent loyalists²⁶ like Joseph Galloway blamed the Revolution on Congregationalists and Presbyterians²⁷. Loyalists cried anti-Catholicism against the French Alliance (1778), and Federalists²⁸ later took a similar po-

sition, using the Alien and Sedition Acts²⁹ (1798) against French and Irish Catholics. Jeffersonian Democracy³⁰ early enlisted Presbyterian and Baptist³¹ support by opposing church establishments and advocating guaranties of religious liberty, but lost some religious support in 1796 and 1800 because of alleged sympathy for deism and free-thinking³².

Religion provided dynamic force to unify Jacksonian Democracy³³ into a national party. New and schismatic sects (*see* Religion, American), repudiating Calvinism's aristocratic doctrine of election, responded, with Irish Catholic immigrants, to Jackson's appeal to the disinherited. A new militant evangelism transformed religion into a reforming force, especially in local politics and minor parties, bringing religious support to anti-Masonry, abolitionists, the Liberty party and, after 1834, Native Americanism³⁴. While religion continued to force reform questions into politics, the "Know-Nothing" party³⁵ made religious difference a national issue (1854-56) and, by obscuring the slavery question, pointed the way to later political appeals to religious prejudice.

Northern Baptists and Methodists gave strong support to the Civil War, and their post-bellum Southern missionary activity attached them to the Freedmen's Bureau and the Republican party³⁶. (The Methodist General Conference, Chicago, 1868, prayed for President Johnson's³⁷ conviction) Although post-bellum Southern Democracy was strongly Protestant (Cleveland, Bryan and Wilson were Presbyterians), it enjoyed Catholic³⁸ support in Maryland and Louisiana, and among Irish and Poles in northern cities. Republican efforts to attract northern Irish Catholics suffered when the cry of "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion"³⁹ was raised in the election of 1884. From 1887 to 1896 the anti-Catholic American Protective Association⁴⁰ held the balance of political power in many localities from Ohio to Kansas. Militant reforming Protestantism worked through the Prohibition party (1872), the Woman's Christian Temperance Union (1874), and the Anti-Saloon League (1895), while Methodists led the way after 1900 in advancing the issue of national Prohibition⁴¹. In the 1920's a revived Ku Klux Klan⁴² again introduced religious intolerance into local politics. National parties avoided the issue until the Democratic nomination of Catholic Alfred E. Smith (1928) aroused religious prejudice to vie with "prosperity" in splitting the Solid South⁴³. The political activity of church leaders produced a move in the late 1920's to "get the Church out of politics," but political sermons and church political activity

remain outstanding phenomena of American life.

[S. High, *The Church in Politics*; C. E. Merriam, *The American Party System*; A. M. Schlesinger, *New Viewpoints in American History*; W. W. Sweet, *Story of Religions in America*; A. M. Schlesinger and D. R. Fox, eds., *A History of American Life*, by various authors.]

HAROLD E. DAVIS

Religion on the American Frontier. The predominating influence which was responsible for the great western movements⁹⁹ of population and the settlement of the American frontier⁹⁹ was economic. Religion had little to do with the actual process of settlement as compared with the influence it exerted in the establishment of the original colonies along the Atlantic seaboard. But in the task of building a new society in the West, religious forces played an essential part. In the uncouth and raw frontier society there was much irreligion and scoffing at the things of the spirit, and blatant infidels, largely of the ignorant sort, were numerous. But this by no means was true of the majority. A people inspired by a sense of future greatness, as were the people of the new West, seldom fail to develop an active religious life, and it was certain that the American frontiersman would eventually become interested in religion.

The pioneer is always an individualist, determined to go his own way in religion as well as in politics. This highly developed individualism characteristic of the frontier was a fruitful cause of creating religious diversity. The frontier produced bold and daring religious leaders who organized their followers into new and aggressive organizations. Excellent examples of this type of frontier religious leadership are those furnished by Alexander Campbell, the organizer of the Disciples denomination, and Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet⁹⁹. In the older churches the peculiar needs of the West called for new methods and new agencies. The camp meeting⁹⁹ was a peculiar frontier institution and became the most important single social and religious agency in the early West. It was used with especial effectiveness by the Methodists, Baptists and Cumberland Presbyterians⁹⁹.

Generally speaking, frontier religion was emotional and revivalistic⁹⁹; even the more staid bodies such as the Presbyterians and Congregationalists⁹⁹ being revivalistic in their emphasis. Since by far the largest proportion of people living on the frontier were without church affiliation, the principal object in preaching was to win new converts. The appeal was generally to the heart and the emotions rather than to the head and the reason. In promoting religion in

the West numerous agencies were formed in the East such as Home Missionary Societies, Bible and Tract Societies and other organizations of this type, which were largely supported by Eastern benevolence.

[W. W. Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier: The Baptists*, *Religion on the American Frontier: The Presbyterians*, and *Rise of Methodism in the West*; P. G. Mode, *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Religious Education, or the religious instruction of children, in its broadest sense began in America with the coming of the Puritans, and especially with the publication of the *New-England Primer*⁹⁹, often called the little Bible of New England. In fact throughout the colonies education was permeated with the religious spirit and there were few schools which did not furnish religious instruction. The rise of the Sunday Schools⁹⁹ marks an important development in religious education. In a more limited sense the term Religious Education has been specifically applied to the movement begun in 1903 under the leadership of William Rainey Harper to raise the standards of religious and moral education in American Protestantism. Its purpose was to bring progressive educational ideas into the service of religious instruction. The disappearance of the Bible⁹⁹ from the public schools, due to increasing Catholic population, and the growing realization of the educational inadequacy of the Sunday School gave impetus to the movement. Religious educationalists also point to the publication of Horace Bushnell's *Christian Nurture* as starting a movement among evangelical bodies away from revivalism⁹⁹ and toward a greater emphasis upon religious instruction. This new emphasis has led to a decided development among Protestant churches generally. Many of the larger churches now employ Religious Education directors while denominational colleges and theological seminaries have established professorships of Religious Education.

[Arlo Ayres Brown, *The History of Religious Education in Recent Times*; Sanford Fleming, *Children and Puritanism*; Luther A. Weigle, *The Teaching Work of the Church*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Religious Liberty is perhaps the greatest contribution America has made both in the realm of politics and of religion. At the time of the establishment of the American colonies there was no country in Europe without a state church, and everywhere, with the possible exception of Holland, unity of religion was considered essential to the unity of the state. There is a mistaken notion, widely held, that the Reformation more or less automatically brought about religious

liberty, but nothing is farther from the truth. The Reformation resulted in the establishment of numerous national churches, as in England, Scotland, Holland and the Scandinavian countries, which were as intolerant of Roman Catholicism and the small dissenting sects as Roman Catholicism was intolerant of them.

Besides the national churches which arose out of the religious and political upheaval of the Reformation, there also developed numerous small sects, generally poor and despised, most of them taking as their pattern the primitive church of the first three centuries. These small minority bodies generally stood for the separation of church and state, and complete religious liberty. It is an important fact to bear in mind that religious liberty and the separation of church and state have been principally advocated by the small minority sects and never by the great state churches. The English Baptists⁹⁰, a small despised sect, took over the principles of the Anabaptists of the continent and held to religious liberty as their first and greatest principle. The Quakers⁹¹ also became the advocates of freedom of conscience. Another source of the principle of religious liberty is found in the 16th- and 17th-century political philosophers such as Sir Thomas More who pictured in his ideal state one where there was complete religious liberty, and John Locke who wrote an important series of essays on religious toleration.

The American colonies became the first place in the world where complete religious liberty was actually tried in a political state. Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island, had become thoroughly imbued with this idea and when he established Rhode Island the principle was there put into operation. Another factor which made the American colonies a fruitful place for the growth of this principle was the fact that a majority of the colonies were begun as proprietary grants, where the governments as well as the land were controlled by the same individual or groups of individuals. This meant that, in order to attract settlers to buy and settle the land, persecuted religious groups from almost every country in western Europe were invited to come to these colonies. Thus William Penn, Lord Baltimore and the proprietors of the Carolinas and Georgia welcomed the persecuted sectaries. Still another factor creating an environment in America favorable to religious liberty was the fact that, by the end of the colonial period, a great majority of the population throughout the colonies was unchurched, and unchurched people generally are opposed to granting special privileges to any one religious body. It is an interesting and sig-

nificant fact that the political leaders who led in the movement to separate church and state, with the establishment of independence, as James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, were nonchurch members. Of all the colonial religious bodies the Baptists were the most tenacious in their advocacy of religious liberty and as a whole made the largest contribution toward its achievement.

In the colonies south of Pennsylvania the Anglican church⁹² was established by law, but only in Maryland and Virginia was it a factor of significance. In Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire the Congregational church⁹³ was the privileged body, but by the end of the colonial period the factors noted above had considerably relaxed its control. The great colonial awakenings⁹⁴ had strengthened the dissenting bodies especially in the Middle and Southern colonies and the coming of the Revolution gave them an opportunity to bargain for greater privileges. Although there were no direct religious issues involved in the War for Independence, yet the disturbed political and social situation which it created, together with the necessity for the formation of new governments, gave opportunity for the new principle, religious liberty, to be incorporated in the new constitutions as they were adopted. Thus, the new state and Federal constitutions simply took over, in this respect, what already was, to a large degree, in practical operation.

[Sanford H. Cobb, *Rise of Religious Liberty in America*; M. L. Greene, *The Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut*; E. F. Humphrey, *Nationalism and Religion in America*; H. R. McIlwaine, *Struggle of the Protestant Dissenters for Religious Toleration in Virginia*; W. W. Sweet, *The Colonial Environment and Religious Liberty*, in *Church History*, January, 1935.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Religious Periodicals. During the Great Awakening⁹⁵ Thomas Prince edited *The Christian History* (1743-45), the first religious periodical in America. There were few such in the colonial period, for sermons were generally printed as pamphlets, but after 1800 religious controversies and revivals stimulated publication. Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury edited the Methodist *Arminian Magazine* (1789-90), the first denominational periodical. It was followed by Baptist, Unitarian, Universalist, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Catholic⁹⁶ periodicals in turn. Deism, missionary activity and slavery⁹⁷ were live issues, the latter soon dividing the religious press. Religious fervor was giving way to reform⁹⁸, and some journals, with such editors or contributors as Orestes Brownson, William Ellery Channing and Theodore Parker, were becoming literary. The *Independent*, start-

ed as a Congregationalist and antislavery^{er} periodical in 1848, became undenominational after the Civil War, and was especially influential through the writings of Henry Ward Beecher and Theodore Tilton. Narrow denominationalism and violent controversy, however, marked many postwar religious reviews. They were conservative in theology, often written by and for clergymen, and were frequently dependent upon church subsidies.

In addition to reviews there were religious newspapers, numbering 208 in 1870. These represent the trend toward secularization, noted in the *Independent*. They grew through the publication of nonreligious matter, while the theological reviews languished. The increase in the number of titles, however, was often evidence only of new viewpoints or schisms seeking an organ; and religious journalism did not regain the strong position it held in the early 19th century.

[L. N. Richardson, *History of Early American Magazines*; F. L. Mott, *History of American Magazines*; Algernon Tassin, *The Magazine in America*.]

MILTON W. HAMILTON

Religious Thought and Writings. The religious ideas current in America for the first one hundred years were transplantations from the Old World. The first American contribution to religious thought came as a result of the colonial revivals^{er}, the first distinctly American development in religion, and center about the name of Jonathan Edwards. Though firmly based upon the legalistic Calvinistic system, Edwards' theology found a place for a personal and emotional element which made it effective for revivalistic preaching. The author of many theological treatises, Edwards' principal works were *A Treatise Concerning the Religious Affections* (1746); *Freedom of the Will* (1754); *Doctrine of Original Sin Defended* (1757); and *The Nature of True Virtue* (1765). Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803), a student of Edwards, became the leader of a new emphasis in New England theology known as Hopkinsianism which stressed "disinterested benevolence." A prolific writer, Hopkins was the first American theologian to form his theology into a system (Two Vols. 1793). No one did more to popularize New England theology or to combat the growing infidelity of the time, than Timothy Dwight, president of Yale College (1795-1817). His *Theology, Explained and Defended* (5 Vols.) went through many editions both in America and abroad. Nathaniel W. Taylor (1786-1858), the last important figure in the Edwardian school, and the first Professor of Theology at Yale Divinity School, took as his motto, "follow truth

if it carries you over Niagara Falls." This he conscientiously followed, resulting in his throwing overboard the last vestiges of Calvinism^{er}. Taylorism was widely accepted outside Congregationalism and was one of the immediate causes of the division in Presbyterianism in 1837. A contemporary of Taylor was Charles G. Finney^{er}, who besides emphasizing a phase of perfectionism stressed the "disinterested benevolence" of the New England school. It was the latter emphasis in New England theology which largely underlay the many benevolent enterprises of the first half of the 19th century.

Two different types of reaction against Edwardian Calvinism are those represented by William Ellery Channing and Horace Bushnell. Channing, recognized as the father of American Unitarianism, was less interested in the interpretation of a creed than in the advocacy of a liberal, gentle, kindly and considerate judgment of those from whom he might differ. This liberal Channing spirit has exercised a beneficent influence in American life. Bushnell, a student of Taylor's at Yale, reacted against his teacher's theology, especially its cold legalism, which he considered lacked both life and common sense. Bushnell's writings, *Christian Nurture* (1847), *Nature and the Supernatural* (1860), the *Vicarious Sacrifice* (1866), and his *Moral Uses of Dark Things* (1868), were not only the basis for the best American preaching for two generations, but changed the emphasis in enlightened religion in America. George A. Gordon (1853-1918), Theodore T. Munger (1830-1910), and Newman Smyth (1843-1925) carried on the Bushnell liberal emphasis, while the best pulpit expression of the Bushnell theology is found in the preaching of Phillips Brooks. Indeed it may be stated that active ministers rather than professors of theology have made the most fruitful contributions to American religious thought.

Presbyterian and Lutheran theology in America have followed more or less closely their European patterns. Charles Hodge (1820-78), professor of theology at Princeton Theological Seminary, was a powerful conservative force. His oft quoted statement, "A new idea never originated in this seminary," illustrates his type of conservatism. James H. Thornwell (1812-62), professor of theology at the Presbyterian Seminary, Columbia, S. C., was the most influential defender of the slave system, from the theological standpoint, and his position won wide acceptance in the South. Samuel S. Schmucker, founder and professor of theology at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, was the most influential among the early Lutheran theologians. In his

prolific writings he attempted to popularize theology and to bring American ideas to bear upon American Lutheranism. More recently H. E. Jacobs of Philadelphia is a good representative of Lutheran theological scholarship. As a result of their conservatism in theology, both Presbyterians and Lutherans have generally been found among the most conservative elements in political, social and economic affairs, as well as in religion.

William Newton Clarke (1841-1912), professor of theology at Colgate Theological Seminary, has exercised a large liberalizing influence through his *An Outline of Christian Theology* (1898). It was an epoch-making book in that it was the first survey of Christian theology which accepted the modern view of the world. A new emphasis in theology is that which has arisen from the growing interest in the social gospel. President H. C. King's *Theology and the Social Consciousness* (1907), Gerald B. Smith's *Social Idealism and the Changing Theology* (1913), and Walter Rauschenbusch's *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (1917) were important books in supplying a theological basis for the new emphasis in religion. Shailer Mathews, Washington Gladden and Francis G. Peabody were also active in this field. Borden P. Bowne (1847-1910), professor of philosophy at Boston University, was the founder of a new school of theological thought which he called the personalist theology. In his principal writings he emphasized the immanence of God and the ethical character of religious experience. He was a militant theist, holding that "Unconscious intelligence means nothing at all." Bowne's principal contribution was to restore confidence in religious faith at a time when it was cowering under the onslaughts of the new science.

Mormonism and Christian Science⁹⁹⁹ are the largest among numerous religious bodies in America which are based upon a body of teaching outside the usual Christian framework. The *Book of Mormon* (1830), which the Mormons call the Bible of the Western World, contains the basic Mormon teaching, claiming that it contains the "restored Gospel of Jesus Christ." Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy's *Science and Health*, first published in 1875, has gone through many subsequent editions and is the Christian Science textbook, in constant use among faithful Scientists. The Society of Silent Unity owes its origin to the combined influence of New Thought and Christian Science and has been active through its numerous publications in spreading its peculiar teaching. Other groups such as Theosophy and the Vedanta and Yogoda-Sat-Sanga Societies

draw their inspiration from the occult literature of the East.

[Frank Hugh Foster, *A Genetic History of New England Theology*; John W. Buckham, *Progressive Religious Thought in America*; Vernon Louis Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought*; Edwin E. Aubrey, *Present Theological Tendencies*; Frank Hugh Foster, *The Modern Movements in American Theology . . . from the Civil War to the World War*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

"Remember the Alamo." The bitterness of the Texans over the massacres at the Alamo and at Goliad⁹⁹⁹ found expression in this battle cry, the words of which had been used by Gen. Houston in a stirring address to his men two days before the battle of San Jacinto⁹⁹⁹, April 21, 1836.

[H. H. Bancroft, *North Mexican States and Texas*; Marquis James, *The Raven*.]

C. T. NEU

"Remember the Maine" was a popular slogan current just before and during the war with Spain⁹⁹⁹ (1898). Popular opinion, led by such "yellow" journals as the *New York Journal* and *World*, held Spain responsible for the destruction of the battleship *Maine*⁹⁹⁹ in Havana harbor (Feb. 15, 1898). The *Journal* boasted that its readers had known "immediately after the destruction of the *Maine* that she was blown up by a Spanish mine." The *World*, by Feb. 20, declared it had "proved" destruction by a mine, and when the report of a naval court of inquiry sustained this position, announced: "*It is in itself a cause of war if not atoned for . . . If Spain will not punish her miscreants, we must punish Spain.*" This sentiment was echoed in the service journals, the *Army and Navy Register* and *Army and Navy Journal*, and in Congress, where one senator declared, "The battle cry on sea and land will be 'Remember the *Maine*.'" The resentment embodied in the phrase contributed immeasurably to the war spirit.

[Joseph E. Wisan, *The Cuban Crisis as Reflected in the New York Press*; M. W. Wilkerson, *Public Opinion and the Spanish-American War*.]

JULIUS W. PRATT

Removal, Executive Power of. The Constitution of the United States is silent on the subject of removals. Not until the administration of President Jackson, however, was the right of the Chief Executive to make removals seriously questioned. Though Jackson replaced not more than one fifth of the officeholders instead of making a "clean sweep" as alleged, his political enemies, led by Sen. Henry Clay, sought unsuccessfully to secure the adoption by Congress of four resolutions designed to limit the President's removal power.

For over thirty years thereafter, no further

serious attempt was made to curtail the presidential removal power. Then, on March 2, 1867, Congress passed the Tenure-of-Office Act⁷ over President Johnson's veto. This act specified that no civil officer appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate could be removed without the consent of the Senate. President Johnson violated the act by removing his Secretary of War. He was quickly impeached⁸ by the House of Representatives but was acquitted by the Senate by a one-vote margin in 1868. The act was eventually repealed in 1886 without having its constitutionality tested before the Supreme Court.

Another attempted limitation was through an act of July 12, 1876, which fixed a four-year term for first-class postmasters and specified that they could not be removed during such term without the consent of the Senate. President Wilson violated the act in 1920 by removing Postmaster Myers⁹ of Portland, Oreg. This led to a test in 1926 before the Supreme Court which ruled, 5 to 3, that a President had full authority to remove "executive officers."

Apparently relying on this decision, President F. D. Roosevelt in 1933 removed W. E. Humphrey¹⁰, a member of the Federal Trade Commission¹¹. This resulted in a unanimous decision by the Supreme Court on May 27, 1935, that the President was without constitutional authority to remove a member of an independent agency except for a reason stated by Congress. Despite this decision, President Roosevelt in 1938 removed A. E. Morgan from the chairmanship of the Tennessee Valley Authority¹², thus paving the way for another court review of the removal power. (See also Appointments and the Appointing Power.)

Generally speaking, the power of state governors to make removals is much more limited than is that of a President. The power is usually hedged about with constitutional or statutory limitations. In some states, removals can be made only with the consent of the state senate.

[E. M. Eriksson, *The Federal Service under President Jackson*, in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, March, 1927; E. S. Corwin, *The President's Removal Power under the Constitution*; W. F. Dodd, *State Government*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Removal Act of 1830. In his first annual message to Congress Dec. 8, 1829, President Jackson recommended legislation looking to the removal of the Indians from east of the Mississippi River. A bill was introduced in the House of Representatives, Feb. 24, to carry this recommendation into effect. Though bitterly opposed in and out of Congress, it was enacted by a close vote May

28, 1830. It authorized the President to cause territory west of the Mississippi to be divided into districts suitable for exchange with Indians living within any state or territory of the United States for lands there claimed and occupied by them; authorized the President to make such exchange; and to aid in the removal of the Indians (see Indian Removal).

[IV U. S. *Statutes at Large*, 4:11; Grant Foreman, *Indian Removal*.]

GRANT FOREMAN

Removal of Deposits. As early as Sept. 19, 1832, the *Washington Globe*, President Jackson's official organ, began hinting that the veto of the bill rechartering the Second Bank of the United States¹³ would be followed by the removal of the government deposits from the institution. Later, the *Globe* prepared the public for the action by attacking the bank's handling of government funds.

In July, 1833, Amos Kendall was sent to arrange with state banks¹⁴ to receive the deposits. Jackson then called his Cabinet together on Sept. 18, 1833, and, after explaining his purpose, assumed responsibility for the removal policy. Two days later, the *Globe* officially announced that the removals would be made. Since Secretary of the Treasury W. J. Duane refused to order the removal he was dismissed and replaced by R. B. Taney, who carried out the President's program. Later, both Jackson and Taney were censured by the Senate for their parts in the episode.

[R. C. H. Catterall, *The Second Bank of the United States*.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Remuda, a Spanish word taken over by the ranching industry: any unit, varying greatly in number, of "saddle" (cow) horses, whether being ridden, scattered over the range, or herded by the horse wrangler (*remudero*). All range and trail work must be done on horseback; hence the *remuda's* importance. J. FRANK DOBIE

Rendezvous. See Trappers' Rendezvous.

Reno, Fort (Okla.). The site of this post was established in the Indian Territory¹⁵ (then frequently disturbed by Indian outbreaks) in 1874. In 1876 it was named in honor of Gen. J. L. Reno. It was garrisoned continuously until 1908, when it became a remount depot, and later a quartermaster's intermediate depot.

[Charles J. Sullivan, *Army Posts and Towns*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Reno, Fort (Wyo.). Fort Connor¹⁶, a stockade built on Powder River¹⁷ in 1865, was enlarged in 1866 by Col. Carrington and named Fort

Reno, for Gen. J. L. Reno, killed in the Civil War. Acceding to Indian demands, it was abandoned in 1868, but was temporarily re-established in 1876.

[G. R. Hebard and E. A. Brininstool, *The Bozeman Trail*.]

LEROY R. HAFEN

Reorganization, Corporate, procedure is peculiarly associated with railroads and divides roughly into four periods. Until 1884 corporate mortgages were construed literally, hence receivers took over the business whenever there was any failure to pay claims. The Wabash "consent" receivership (1888) introduced the second period. This device, by which the directors and not outside creditors put the corporation into court, soon became general. Relative priority of security holders, the contribution of the third period, was first fully expressed in the Santa Fé reorganization (1895). Absolute priority of bondholders gave way to the principle that all security holders should share in the sacrifices of readjustment. Amendment of the Bankruptcy Act⁷ in 1934 (Section 77B) initiated the present phase. This provided an alternative, not a substitute, for previous reorganization procedure. Innovations were: replacement of receivers by trustees; elimination of ancillary receiverships and judicial sales; and binding all security holders of a given class to provisions acceptable to two thirds of that class.

Reorganization of industrial corporations presents problems quite different from that of railroads. The latter is usually due to failure in inherent earning capacity, whereas the former generally follows dissipation of working capital. Since industrials endeavor to avoid receivership because of consequent ill effects upon patronage, voluntary and internal reorganizations have been the rule, outstandingly true in 1920-22. Because such plans cannot be forced upon recalcitrant creditors and because the national scope and tremendous size of industrials has tinged them with public interest⁸, the trend is to rely increasingly upon external reorganization. The Securities Act⁹ (1933) provided greater ease in issuing securities by embarrassed corporations, thus encouraging formal reorganization.

The significance of reorganization is its recurrence with every depression¹⁰. It became tremendously important when one third of the railroad mileage of the country (1938) was insolvent. While recent periods have demonstrated a decline in numbers, there is a decided tendency for the average tenure of railroad reorganizations to increase (1870, two years; 1938, five years), resulting in heavy monetary and social costs.

[A. S. Dewing, *The Financial Policy of Corporations*; J. N. Rosenberg, *Corporate Reorganization and the Federal Court*; P. M. O'Leary, *Corporate Enterprise in Modern Economic Society*.]

W. B. LOCKLING

Reorganization, Government. See Administrative Reorganization, The Movement for.

Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints claims to be the continuation of and successor to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, organized by Joseph Smith, Jr., on April 6, 1830, at Fayette, New York (see Mormons). The church in 1831 established headquarters at Kirtland, Ohio, where it built the Kirtland Temple, which still belongs to this church. After migrating to Jackson County, Mo., in 1831, the members suffered persecutions, attributable largely to their rapid growth, their antislavery sentiments and the resulting political fears of other settlers. They were forced to move to the neighboring counties of Clay, Ray, Caldwell and Daviess (1833), but were not allowed to remain, and in 1838 were expelled from Missouri by order of Gov. Lilburn W. Boggs on threat of extermination. They then (1839) settled at Nauvoo¹¹, Ill., which by 1844 was the largest city in that state.

Joseph Smith, Jr., their prophet-president, and his brother were killed by a mob at Carthage, Ill., June 27, 1844, while under a pledge of protection by Gov. Thomas Ford. Confusion followed. Many factions were formed. A small proportion followed Brigham Young to Utah; another group followed Sidney Rigdon to Pennsylvania; a third followed James J. Strang¹² to Wisconsin and Michigan. A number, desiring to maintain the original faith, finally formed a new group in 1852, still under the name The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. To this group came Joseph Smith, III, the oldest son, and Emma Smith, the widow of Joseph Smith, Jr., and were accepted on their original baptism. All of the children, the sister and only surviving brother of Joseph Smith, Jr., and later his descendants, affiliated with this group. In October, 1869, for legal reasons the word "Reorganized" was added to the name. Independence, Mo., was named as the central place for the establishment of Zion, "the pure in heart." There followed a suit in the United States Circuit Court, decided in 1894, for possession of the Temple Lot there. In this case, in which the three principal factions of the Church of the Latter Day Saints were involved, the court decided that the "Reorganized Church" was the true successor, with doctrines and practices identical with those of the original

church. The pleadings put in issue the question of polygamy⁷⁷ and Judge John F. Philips held it was no part of the teaching or practice of the original church, thereby exonerating Joseph Smith, Jr., of responsibility for the teaching. These doctrines and practices of the original church included social ideals, monogamous marriage, a re-establishment of the New Testament Church with the Holy Scriptures as the fundamental basis of teaching. They also accept the *Book of Mormon*⁷⁸ as a record of early inhabitants of America and the *Doctrine and Covenants*, a collection of revelations of today. They differ from other Christian churches in the emphasis upon the right to revelation as a body and individually and the spiritual gifts as set forth in I Corinthians 12. They reject the name Mormon because of the association of the name in the popular mind with doctrines and practices which they have always repudiated.

[*Reorganized Church v. Church of Christ*, 60 Fed. Rep. 937; *Saint's Herald*, Cincinnati, Plano, Lamoni, Independence, 1860, Heman C. Smith and Joseph Smith, *History of the Church*, Lamoni, Iowa, four volumes 1830 to 1890; *Journal of History*, Herald Publishing House, 1908 to 1925, 18 volumes (Reorganized); Heman C. Smith, *True Succession in Church Presidency*, Lamoni, Iowa, 1900 (Reorganized); *Doctrine and Covenants*, Kirtland, Ohio, 1835 and later editions to 1938; Decision of Honorable L. S. Sherman, Feb. 23, 1880, in the Court of Common Pleas, Lake County, Ohio, in re the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints v. Lucy N. Williams, John Taylor, the Church in Utah, *et al*; Lucy Smith, Joseph Smith and His Progenitors, Liverpool, 1854 and later editions.]

S. A. BURGESS

Reparation Commission, THE (1920-30), was by Articles 231-235 of Part VIII of the Treaty of Versailles⁷⁹, directed to estimate damage done by Germany to Allied civilians and their property, and to formulate methods of collecting assessments, since the Paris conferees had become deadlocked on the issue. In June, 1920, the Supreme Council decided that Germany should pay at least three billion gold marks for thirty-five years, the total not to exceed 269 billion marks. Within this frame, and after sanctions had been applied because of German defaults, the Commission, on advice of a Committee of Experts, reported to the Supreme Council in April, 1921, that damages amounted to 132 billion marks and recommended annual payments of two billion marks and 26% of German exports with a cash payment of one billion marks by Sept. 1. Economic and monetary chaos in Germany coupled with resentment at the reparations scheme brought a Franco-Belgian force into the Ruhr. By the time of complete collapse of the German mark accompanied by dislocation of

world trade, there had been paid in cash, commodities and services an amount which was estimated by the Commission at approximately ten and a half billion gold marks, by the Germans at something over 42 billion marks and by various economists at sums somewhere between these extremes. Of this indeterminate amount the United States received nothing of the reparations *per se*, although considerable sums had been paid to reimburse expenses of the Army of Occupation⁸⁰, damage in the United States and the like.

In 1922 Secretary Hughes had suggested, although the United States not being a party to the Treaty of Versailles technically had nothing to do with the matter, that the whole issue be taken out of politics and adjusted on economic principles, and intimated that the services of American experts might be available. Accordingly, a committee, with Charles G. Dawes⁸¹ as chairman, worked out a plan to go into effect on Sept. 1, 1924, with a sliding scale of annuities in cash and kind, together with suggestions how revenues should be raised and payments distributed. In the opinion of competent economists the plan worked fairly well, at least in the short run, providing for the payment of nearly ten billion marks to the creditors and at the same time allowing stabilization of German currency and an upward trend in German economic life, even though no definite aggregate total had been fixed. Desire on the part of the creditor powers to arrange a definitive settlement and to have turned into marketable bonds Germany's future obligations brought a second committee of experts, even though Germans were afraid of the effect such an arrangement would have upon them. The conference, meeting under the chairmanship of Owen D. Young in the spring of 1929, produced a new plan which, somewhat modified by the Reparation Commission especially on the insistence of Great Britain, arranged for annuities running until 1988 and aggregating with interest 121 billion marks. On May 17, 1930, the Young Plan⁸² went into operation and on that day the Reparation Commission ceased operations. In barely two years, however, payments stopped with the Hoover moratorium⁸³ effective June 30, 1931, after a sum of 2,871,000,000 marks had been turned over to the creditor nations. Thenceforward, to all intents and purposes reparations were suspended regardless of the Lausanne Agreement⁸⁴ (July 9, 1932) which attempted to replace the Young Plan with a set of new and reduced obligations.

In American popular estimation reparations were tied to debts owed the United States by various governments which had been ranged

against Germany in the World War or had been advanced loans subsequently (*see* War Debts, World War). The Government of the United States, however, never acknowledged any such relationship even though such payments as had been made on these debts actually had been derived from Germany. (*See also* War Claims Act.)

[John W. Wheeler-Bennett and Hugh Latimer, *Information on the Reparation Settlement*; James W. Angell, *Reparations*, in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, XIII, 300.]

L. B. SHIPPEE

Repeating is a corrupt election practice in which persons cast ballots in more than one precinct at the same election, or vote under different names more than once in the same precinct. The practice, at one time notorious in large cities, has largely disappeared with the adoption of adequate personal registration^{es} laws (including signature tests) and the appointment of honest and vigilant election officials.

[F. R. Kent, *The Great Game of Politics*; M. R. Werner, *Tammany Hall*; E. R. Finch, *The Fight for a Clean Ballot*, in *Independent*, LXVIII.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Representation. When a political community becomes too large in area or population to permit all of the electors to foregather to discuss and decide political questions, some system of representation becomes necessary. The smaller New England towns are the sole examples of pure democracy in the United States today (*see* Town-Meetings). Elsewhere, representative democracy is the rule.

Representation may be secured by one of three different methods: (1) according to population, the society being divided into constituencies, each including approximately the same number of people (*see* Apportionment, Constitutional); or (2) according to area, the territory under the jurisdiction of the government being divided arbitrarily into geographical districts (*see* Gerymander); or (3) according to occupational or economic interest, the society being divided along functional lines, each economic group being assigned representation.

In the United States, the lower house of Congress^{es} represents population, each state being assigned a number of representatives based on the population ratio established by Congress. The Senate represents areas. In the states both areas and population have been used. In many states, area representation has given rural areas, in one house or another, members out of all proportion to their population. Such conditions have accentuated conflicts between rural and urban areas. Functional representation has nev-

er been used by any political unit in the United States.

Systems of voting have an important effect upon representation. The most common type, in the United States, is that dictated by the Australian ballot^{es}. Election is by a plurality vote. In a few cases clear majorities are required, necessitating run-off elections if no candidate has a majority at the first election. Cumulative voting is used for the election of the lower house of the Illinois legislature. The districts each elect three representatives. Each voter has three votes which he may cast for one candidate or divide between two or distribute among three. A minority which will cumulate its votes on one candidate may thus elect him. Preferential voting^{es} permits voters to indicate their preferences among the candidates up to as many as there are places to be filled. If no candidate has a clear majority of first choices, second choices are added. If there is still no majority, a plurality elects. Minority candidates are often successful under this system. Proportional representation^{es} uses preferential ballots and secures to each substantial minority in the electorate representation in proportion to its voting strength.

[Robert Luce, *Legislative Principles*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Representative Government. According to John Stuart Mill, the definition of representative government is, "that the whole people, or some numerous portion of them, exercise through deputies periodically elected by themselves the ultimate controlling power, which, in every constitution, must reside somewhere." Or, in other words, ". . . it is a control over the government by the people, who, while not in person present at the seat of government, are nevertheless present by their representatives" (H. J. Ford).

Representative government came from a remote past in English history and later was introduced in the American colonies along with other British legal and political institutions. According to the best authorities, it arose in England from a transformation of local and private petitions of individual members into the common petitions of the High Court of Parliament.

During mediæval times the members of Parliament were summoned to the court at Westminster to vote taxes, and at the same time they brought up petitions for redress of grievances from their various constituencies. It was discovered that these petitions had much in common among them. It occurred to the members that if they should pool their common grievances and express them in a common petition, these same

common petitions would have a united force behind them and could be backed with the united powers of taxation.

By the time of Edward II (1307-27) these common petitions developed into the public bills of the House of Commons and became "in time the predominant organ of legislation, and gave it still later control over the whole executive government. . . . Strictly speaking, the House of Commons today possesses no right of legislation; its Bills are still in the form of petitions and the Crown alone enacts" (A. F. Polard).

The first representative government in America was instituted in the colony of Virginia in 1619 (*see* Colonial Assemblies). The colonial legislature, which then assembled, was composed of a governor and six councillors, appointed by the officials of the Virginia Company⁹⁹ in England, and also two representatives elected by each borough. These latter formed the lower house. Gradually this system was introduced, in some similar form, in all the thirteen colonies and likewise became a fundamental feature of government, both colonial and local, in all parts of British America.

It will be noted that the basis of representation in England was that of classes. The lords temporal and lords spiritual met in the upper chamber, or House of Lords, and representatives of the commoners in the lower or popular chamber, the House of Commons. But the Virginia House of Burgesses was on a territorial basis of representation⁹⁹, and this became the principle accepted by the Americans throughout their history.

The British government has been called the Mother of Parliaments since its bicameral⁹⁹ form of House of Lords and House of Commons has been considered the model for parliamentary institutions throughout the world in the development of modern democracies.

All attempts at colonial union, such as the United Colonies of New England (1643) and the Stamp Act Congress (1765), were upon the basis of representation of each colony, and finally resulted in the meeting of the First Continental Congress at Philadelphia in 1774⁹⁹. During the meeting of the Second Continental Congress in 1775, news was received of the battles of Lexington and Concord⁹⁹. This Congress at once assumed the sovereign powers of a national legislative body or parliament and remained the main organ of government (*see* Confederation, The) until the United States Constitution went into effect in the year 1789 and the new United States Congress⁹⁹ began its career. The name

Congress was thus perpetuated. Meanwhile the colonial assemblies had been changed into state legislatures and a like organization of government was created in each one of the later states before it was admitted into the Union.

According to the late Henry Jones Ford, certain conditions are essential if a representative system is to be established. These are. (1) the people should be free to choose their own representatives; (2) the representative assembly should be face to face with the administration of the government; (3) the representatives should use their authority only on public account and not for private laws or purposes; (4) elections should be confined to the choice of representatives; and (5) the supervision and control by the representative assembly should extend over the whole field of government.

It will be seen that both our National and state governments have consistently, and at times persistently, violated one or more of these fundamental conditions, but the success of our government, in spite of this fact, shows the inherent capacity of the American people for self-government and likewise their political ability.

It usually is considered fundamental that a legislative body should incarnate and express the public opinion or community feeling of the country or state for which it legislates. The executive should lead the legislative body and co-ordinate the will of the latter as the controlling force over the administration. This is made especially difficult by the system of separation of powers⁹⁹, and makes most necessary and important the existence of political parties⁹⁹ in order to co-ordinate these two departments of our government.

Leadership may take the form either of parliamentary government according to the British model, or presidential government according to the American system as later developed. But in the United States the presidential form of government still leaves undetermined the relative importance of executive or congressional leadership (*see* President, The; President's Message).

During recent years dissatisfaction with both class and territorial systems of representation has led to the advocacy of other forms, although these new and more or less ideal plans have as yet won but little favor in the United States. One of these is functional representation, by which different interests, economic or political, may be adequately represented as such. The other is proportional representation⁹⁹, which would have the legislative body correspond as nearly as possible to the relative proportions of various party votes cast in the election, so that the represen-

Representatives, House of

tation may be a proportional replica of the political sentiment outside its walls. This latter system has been introduced into the governments of New York City, Cincinnati and other municipalities.

[Henry Jones Ford, *Representative Government*; Sir John Marriott, *This Realm of England*, John Stuart Mill, *Representative Government*; A. F. Pollard, *The Commonwealth at War* and *The Evolution of Parliament*.]

WILLIAM STARR MYERS

Representatives, House of. See Congress, The United States.

Reprisal, Letters of. See Marque and Reprisal, Letters of.

Republic. The word "republic" as used in the United States has come to mean a government based upon the principle of sovereignty of the people and involving the exercise of the suffrage by a large portion of the people for the choice of the principal executive and legislative officials. It means, further, a government of limited powers and of the separation of powers^o, with both elements of this social contract embodied in a written constitution.

In the colonial period several colonies at one time or another had governments approximating fairly closely to this definition of republican, notably Rhode Island and Connecticut. The latter was currently cited in 1776 as the nearest approach to the ideal.

When the British government declared the colonies in a state of rebellion and the royal governors disappeared in 1775, the necessity of maintaining law and order required the establishment of provisional governments. Necessarily these had to be on a republican basis as no alternative was available, even if desirable. In the latter part of 1775 the Continental Congress^o authorized New Hampshire, South Carolina and Virginia to draw up provisional forms of government. In May, 1776, it advised the remaining colonies, in view of the prospective Declaration of Independence^o, to do likewise. The first suggestion of the type of government to be adopted was contained in a letter of John Adams, dated Nov. 15, 1775. These ideas were further elaborated in Adams' pamphlet called *Thoughts on Government*, published in January, 1776. The only other suggestions about a republican form of government that had any definite influence were contained in Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*^o, published in January, 1776. Adams' ideas were substantially followed in the first constitutions of most of the states and very soon in all states.

Republican Party (Jeffersonian) 453

The republican form of government seems to have been adopted as the policy of the nation and of the several states as a matter of course, without any definite discussion or explicit action. Republican forms of government were framed and put into operation not only without any republican agitation but apparently with a definite purpose to avoid republican propaganda. The earliest American constitutions were usually drafted by a committee in which a single individual, such as John Rutledge in South Carolina or John Jay in New York or John Adams in Massachusetts, did practically all the work. The one individual who exercised most influence in determining the republican character of American government was undoubtedly John Adams.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER

Republican Party (Jeffersonian) was the first opposition party under the new National Government, its elements appearing in the first two Congresses when the vigorous leadership of Hamilton and his Federalist^o associates aroused the fear and hostility of various members who disliked the funding system, the revenue acts, the first United States Bank and the general tendency to create a powerful national authority by liberal construction of the Constitution. The frank reliance of the Federalists on "the wise and good and rich,"^o their liking for forms and ceremonies which smacked of the aristocratic, and particularly their horror of the French Revolution and all its works, tended to make the opposition the party of the common man and gave it its title of "Republican."

Thomas Jefferson supplied the necessary leadership and philosophy. Organization spread, at least in rudimentary form, throughout the country, the "Democratic Clubs"^o playing an important part. Its leaders realized the importance of propaganda and a number of important newspapers were acquired or founded at strategic points. Jefferson won the Presidency in 1800, carried out a series of mild reforms and innovations, and was re-elected by a huge majority four years later, the Federalists henceforth declining to the position of a factious and intransigent minority largely centered in New England (see Essex Junto). With the election of Madison, however, there ensued a period of twenty years when the Republican party, nominally in power, was in reality a collection of sectional and personal factions rather than a genuine cohesive party. Under its auspices, however, there was a gradual broadening of the suffrage^o, an increasing democratizing of local life, a perceptible emphasis on humanitarian^o reform, and after the War of

1812 the development of a nationalist spirit in striking contrast to the divisions of the Federalist era. New issues, however, were appearing. The tariff, the Second United States Bank and internal improvements⁹⁹ caused a cleavage comparable to that of 1790-1800 and, with the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828, a new and more logical alignment of "National" and "Democratic" Republicans was well established, to evolve, a few years later, into the Whig and Democratic⁹⁹ parties respectively.

[E. E. Robinson, *The Evolution of American Political Parties*; C. A. Beard, *The Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy*; C. M. Wiltse, *The Jeffersonian Tradition in American Democracy*; E. Channing, *The Jeffersonian System*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Republican Party, THE. The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, which repealed the Missouri Compromise⁹⁹ and opened the western territories to slavery, caused a popular revulsion throughout the North and West. Feeling became so strong that a simultaneous series of local movements began to organize in many places at once. These movements rapidly coalesced, and to show their Jeffersonian ancestry (*see* Republican Party, Jeffersonian) they adopted the name "Republican," which name had been discarded by Jackson's followers in favor of "Democratic." Jefferson's influence was the reputed cause of the passage of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787⁹⁹ which had forever banished slavery from the western territory north of the Ohio River. This principle of the nonextension of slavery, made vital by the Free Soil party⁹⁹ of 1848, now became the main platform of the new Republican party. It drew probably one third of its strength from the Democrats⁹⁹ by way of the Free Soil party. The other two thirds came from the Whigs⁹⁹.

The name Republican was first adopted at a local political meeting held in Ripon, Wis., on Feb. 28, 1854, and also was formally adopted by a state convention which met at Jackson, Mich., on July 6, of the same year. The various local movements rapidly perfected their organizations and accepted the name Republican. Many conventions were held on July 13, the anniversary of the passage of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 by the Continental Congress. Among these were state conventions in Indiana, Ohio, Vermont and Wisconsin. The Republican party was not founded in the common acceptance of the term but just grew. It was the expression of a widespread sentiment. Thomas Jefferson, in a real sense, may be reputed the founder of both the Democratic and Republican parties.

John C. Frémont was the first Republican can-

didate for President, in 1856, and although defeated, succeeded in carrying eleven states (*see* Campaign of 1856). The nomination of Abraham Lincoln in 1860 upon a platform which combined free soil principles with that of a protective tariff⁹⁹ united the agricultural and industrial interests of the North and West and, aided by a split in the Democratic party, resulted in electoral triumph. It also resulted in the adoption of the Hamiltonian principles of National Government and commercial advancement, including "sound money" and a protective tariff, which became the underlying basis of Republican policy for the next seventy years.

The successful conduct of the Civil War, under Republican party auspices, firmly entrenched the party in power, but the mistaken policy of Reconstruction⁹⁹ of the defeated South, rather than the Lincoln policy of restoration, drove the southern Whigs into the Democratic party and created the "Solid South"⁹⁹ which has existed since that time. This was caused by the policy of the extremists (*see* Radical Republicans) who, bitterly opposed by Lincoln's successor Andrew Johnson, for selfish political reasons combined with impractical idealism, sought to capitalize the Civil War to the permanent advantage of the Republican party. Up to and including the administration of William McKinley, 1897-1901, there was for the most part a succession of former Union soldiers nominated for the Presidency. These included Ulysses S. Grant, Rutherford B. Hayes, James A. Garfield and Benjamin Harrison in addition to McKinley himself. The party successfully carried all the elections except those of 1884 and 1892.

A change came with the accession of Theodore Roosevelt in 1901. A new and younger generation which was more interested in contemporary social and economic problems than in the outgrown issues of past days gradually came to the front. The struggle between the old and the new forces led to the formation, and transient existence, of the progressive or "Bull-Moose"⁹⁹ party of 1912-16 and resulted in the election of Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic candidate, in the national elections of those two years. This same division existed to a greater or less extent up to the year 1932. Herbert Hoover, who succeeded the strictly orthodox Republican Presidents, Warren G. Harding and Calvin Coolidge, was himself a former Progressive. But his attempts to meet new and pressing social problems were checked by opposition from the more conservative members of his own party in combination with partisan opposition from the Democrats. The depression, which began in the year

1929, caused his overwhelming defeat in the election of 1932.

Both the national parties have followed in turn the contrasting policies of Hamilton or Jefferson as political expediency might dictate. The New Deal[™] of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration carried the old Democratic party into such an extreme of National Government aggression that the principles of Alexander Hamilton were far outdistanced. This caused the Republican party to swing back more in the direction of the original Jeffersonian principles of states' rights[™] but modified in scope by the historical results of the Civil War. The impetus of the political success of the first Franklin D. Roosevelt administration caused an overwhelming Democratic triumph in 1936 and the Republican party fell to the lowest point of its history. The mid-term election of 1938, although resulting in striking Republican gains, was probably a natural reversion to middle-of-the-road conservatism and also a national revival of the old ingrained tradition of the two-party system.

[Arthur N. Holcombe, *The Political Parties of Today*; W. S. Myers, *The Republican Party*.]

WILLIAM STARR MYERS

Repudiation of Public Debt. Some one once remarked that when an individual goes bankrupt he pays, say, one cent on the dollar, but when a nation goes bankrupt it inflates its currency and pays in a one-cent dollar. That is approximately what the United States and many states did in the 1780's. To guard against a repetition, the Constitution provided that "No state . . . shall coin money, emit bills of credit, make anything but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts; pass any law . . . impairing the obligation of contracts. . . ." Only Congress was empowered to "coin money," and nothing was said about issuing bills of credit (the 18th-century name for legal tender Treasury notes). The implication was that only gold and silver coins could be legal tender. This rule was observed until the exigencies of the Civil War produced, on Feb. 25, 1862, the first of several issues of United States notes, familiarly known as "greenbacks"[™] or "legal tenders." They were legal tender for all payments except import duties and interest on the public debt. On July 11, 1864, the value of \$100 of these reached a low of \$35 in gold. The constitutionality of the legal-tender acts was questioned, and on Feb. 7, 1870, in the case of *Hepburn v. Griswold* (8 Wallace 603), the Supreme Court decided, 4 to 3, that the acts were unconstitutional. This decision was reversed May 1, 1871, in *Knox v. Lee* and *Parker v. Davis* (12 Wallace 457) on the grounds that the acts

were a valid exercise of Congress' war powers. In 1884 the Court upheld in *Juilliard v. Greenman*[™] (110 U. S. 421) Congress' right to make Treasury notes legal tender in peace time (see *Legal Tender Cases*). There were several interesting exceptions to the new general rule. In one especially, *Bronson v. Rodes*[™] (7 Wallace 229), decided in December, 1868, the Court held that the legal-tender acts did not apply to obligations specifically calling for payment in gold and silver coin. Accordingly the custom spread of inserting in many kinds of debt contracts, government as well as industrial, the so-called gold clause, one form of which stated that the debt was "payable in gold coin of the United States of the present standard weight and fineness." The practice increased decidedly after the *Sherman Silver Purchase Act* of 1890[™].

Early in March, 1933, the Government temporarily abandoned the gold-coin standard; on April 20 it did so definitely, and gold went to a considerable premium. On June 5 President F. D. Roosevelt signed a joint resolution of Congress declaring all specific gold contracts inoperative. This was practically necessary if we were to devalue, and devaluation[™] was an important instrument of the administration's price-raising policy. On Jan. 31, 1934, the Government ordained a new and smaller gold dollar of 13.71 grains of fine gold (15 5/21 gr. 9/10 fine). It was nearly 41% smaller than the old gold dollar of 23.22 grains of fine gold, which means that the old gold dollar was worth 1.69 of the new.

Four cases (see *Gold Clause Cases*) were brought before the Supreme Court questioning the constitutionality of the resolution of June 5, 1933, and claiming for the creditors, on the basis of the gold clause, \$1.69 for each \$1 owed. Two plaintiffs held railroad bonds, and a third gold certificates. The fourth case, *Perry v. U. S.* (294 U. S. 330), is most pertinent because it involved a Liberty Bond. The decisions were of vital importance, since they affected about \$100,000,000,000 of debt bearing the gold clause, \$21,000,000,000 of it Federal. Hearings were begun Jan. 8, 1935, and the decisions rendered Feb. 18, 1935. The Supreme Court unanimously held the resolution of June 5, 1933, unconstitutional, stating that Congress was vested with power "to authorize the issue of definite obligations for the payment of money borrowed" but not "with authority to alter or destroy those obligations." The Supreme Court, however, refused, 5 to 4, to award damages on the ground that the "plaintiff has not shown or attempted to show that in relation to buying power he had sustained any loss whatsoever." The buying-power theory was

precedent breaking; "value" under the Constitution had theretofore meant weight of gold, not purchasing power. This decision left the way open for suits against the Government as soon as anyone could demonstrate loss in purchasing power. That, presumably, would be easy after prices had risen appreciably. On Aug. 27, 1935, the President signed a joint resolution of Congress closing the Court of Claims to suits of this sort (the Government may refuse to be sued if it chooses), but granting bondholders the privilege, until Jan. 1, 1936, of receiving cash payment for the par value of the bonds plus accrued interest. This was done to eliminate the financial confusion that would have resulted from the success of such suits, but, according to many critics, did so at the expense of the national honor, since the administration admitted by its action that the courts would probably judge the bondholders deserving of further indemnity.

[E. W. Kemmerer, *Money*; Charles Warren, *The Supreme Court in United States History*; R. B. Westerfield, *Money, Credit and Banking*.] DONALD L. KEMMERER

Repudiation of State Debts was the subject of agitated discussion in this country and abroad in the 1840's and the 1870's. In the 1830's various American states incurred heavy debts in the construction of canals and railroads^{qqv}, and in the creation of banks (see *State Banking*). By 1839 the public indebtedness of American states amounted to \$170,000,000. Frequently, in authorizing these loans, the faith of the state was pledged for the payment of the interest and the redemption of the principal. In many cases the laws specified that the bonds should not be sold below par. In negotiating these loans authorized agents of the states violated the state statutes and American bankers aided and abetted them. In London, Baring Brothers and Company and other English banking houses introduced them to their clients; in Amsterdam, Hope and Company. Foreign investors bought with avidity these securities because of the guaranty of the states, the high rate of interest they carried, the high standing of the national credit, and the confidence of foreign bankers in the United States Bank^{rr}. The aggressive salesmanship of American agents abroad somewhat accounts for the lack of caution and prudence upon the part of the European bankers. By 1839 it was estimated that British subjects held between 110 and 165 millions of dollars of American securities. When the American financial structure collapsed in the Panic of 1837^{rr}, European bankers tactlessly suggested that the Federal Government assume the state debts. Whatever merits the

Repudiation of State Debts

scheme might have possessed was lost by the hostility created by its supposedly foreign origin and the scramble for votes in the presidential election of 1840.

Between 1841 and 1842 eight states and one territory defaulted on their interest payments (see *State Debts*). Mississippi repudiated \$5,000,000 of Union Bank bonds in 1842 on the ground that the law providing for their issuance was unconstitutional and that the bonds had been sold on credit to the United States Bank in violation of the state statute. Ten years later the people of Mississippi defeated a tax levy for the purpose of paying the interest on \$2,000,000 of Planters' Bank bonds; and in 1875 an amendment to the state constitution was ratified by the people prohibiting the state from redeeming or paying the Union Bank bonds and the Planters' Bank bonds. In 1842 Florida disavowed her responsibility for \$3,900,000 of bank bonds on the ground that the territorial legislature was not empowered to issue them. In 1842 Michigan repudiated a portion of a \$5,000,000 loan on the ground that the state had not received payment for the bonds obtained by the United States Bank.

There were many reasons for the growth of repudiation sentiment at this time. The sneers and jeers of the foreign press at American integrity fanned the flames of national prejudices; while the universal indebtedness gave an impetus to the movement in favor of repudiation. Repudiation resulted from a series or combination of forces—speculative mania, ignorance of sound banking, a ruinous depression, blatantly demagogic leadership, and the stupidity of the bondholders in refusing to consider propositions that might have resulted in partial payments of their holdings. While it is true that the meagre resources of the American people at that time made it impossible for them to meet their obligations when they fell due, an inability to pay was no justification for refusal to pay.

The second attack of the disease of state repudiation came with the funding of the state debts incurred during the Reconstruction^{rr} era. These bonds were issued by governments that were not representative of the Southern states. Foreign investors were warned not to purchase them. The forced repudiation of the Confederate war debts^{rr} by the Fourteenth Amendment strengthened the Southerner's opposition to the payment of the "bayonet bonds," especially since a large proportion of these securities were held by the "conquerors of the north" who had foisted and maintained the hated reconstruction governments in the South. The ravages of the Civil

War, the misrule of the reconstruction period, and the hard times following the Panic of 1873⁹⁹ increased the heavy burdens of the Southern people; but in no case were the debts scaled or repudiated until it was apparently impossible to discharge them. In 1876 Alabama repudiated \$4,705,000 of railroad bonds. In 1884 Arkansas, after a long dispute, repudiated \$500,000 of bonds held by James Holford of London along with other obligations incurred during the carpetbag regime. In 1876 the supreme court of Florida declared unconstitutional and void \$4,000,000 of railroad bonds. In 1876 Georgia repudiated railroad bonds whose minimum face value amounted to \$9,352,000; and the following year the legislature approved a constitutional amendment confirming the repudiation statutes. The total amount of Louisiana's repudiations between 1875 and 1884 was approximately \$22,000,000. In 1879 North Carolina scaled its debt and repudiated over \$12,000,000 of bonds. In 1873 South Carolina repudiated \$5,965,000 of "conversion bonds."

Foreign creditors had been prevented by the Eleventh Amendment⁹⁹ to the Federal Constitution from seeking redress. In December, 1933, the Principality of Monaco which had come into possession of some of the repudiated Mississippi bonds asked leave to bring suit in the United States Supreme Court against the State of Mississippi; but on May 21, 1934, the Court unanimously held that the Principality could not sue the State of Mississippi.

[R. C. McGrane, *Foreign Bondholders and American State Debts*; W. A. Scott, *The Repudiation of State Debts*.]

REGINALD C. McGRANE

Resaca de la Palma, Battle of (May 9, 1846). The day following Gen. Taylor's minor triumph at Palo Alto, Texas⁹⁹, the Mexican army under Mariano Arista fell back five miles to the Resaca de Guerrero, where natural defenses offset the effectiveness of superior American cannon and necessitated reliance on infantry and cavalry. In these branches Arista had a numerical advantage, and when Taylor attacked in mid-afternoon the Mexicans at first held firm. After a fierce hand-to-hand combat in the underbrush and chaparral, however, the Mexican left gave way before the insistent hammering of Taylor's troops. Arista's flank was turned, and his army crumbled under the American assault. A precipitant flight ensued, Taylor's men pursuing the Mexicans to the bank of the Rio Grande, which the latter crossed with difficulty and without order. Mexican losses were 547 killed, wounded, or missing. The American losses were 33 killed, 89

wounded. Taylor wrote his report at the Resaca de la Palma, which gave the battle its name.

[J. H. Smith, *The War with Mexico*.]

HOLMAN HAMILTON

Reservations, Indian. See Indian Reservations.

Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The Morrill Act of 1862⁹⁹ required that land grant colleges give military training to provide skilled leaders for citizen increments to war forces. Efforts were made in 1911 to integrate these graduates into state militia⁹⁹. However, their assimilation was inefficient, although more than 25,000 graduates of such colleges entered the World War army as officers, through the National Guard or the Officers' Training Camps⁹⁹.

By the National Defense Act⁹⁹ of 1916 a reserve officers' training corps was created for these and other colleges (and for a few secondary schools). This was re-established after the war interruption by the act of 1920. Since that date approximately 6000 students a year have been graduated with commissions in the Officers' Reserve Corps⁹⁹, after four years' training under regular army instructors as part of their college courses. During one summer vacation they attend a six weeks practical camp. Their winter training has been progressively revised in the direction of theoretical study and away from mere drills. When commissioned they are assigned as officers to skeletonized units of the Organized Reserves with headquarters near their homes.

[I. L. Reeves, *Military Education in the United States*; M. M. Chambers, *Every Man a Bruck*; E. Colby, *Military Training in Land Grant Colleges*, in *Georgetown Law Journal*, November, 1934; *Annual Reports of the Secretary of War*.]

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Reserved Powers of States. The Constitution of the United States created a government of enumerated powers⁹⁹. The framers intended that all powers not conferred upon the National Government by the Constitution⁹⁹ nor denied by that document to the states should be retained by the states. In the ratifying conventions questions were raised as to why such an important matter had been left to inference. The first Congress reflected this feeling of uneasiness in proposing a series of amendments. Ten of these were ratified by the states. The Tenth Amendment contained the following language:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

This amendment securely established the United States as a Federal state composed of a

central government and a number of constituent state governments each possessing powers independent of the other.

One who is desirous of ascertaining the powers of the states at any given moment must do so by a negative process. He must first conceive of all of the potential powers of government as a reservoir from which the people have abstracted certain powers to be given to the National Government. These are found principally in Article I of Section 8 of the Constitution where, in seventeen clauses, the powers of Congress⁷⁰ are set forth. Except in a few instances no state may exercise any of these. To the powers expressly conferred upon the National Government by the Constitution, the United States Supreme Court⁷¹ has, by a consistent policy of broad construction, added many implied powers⁷². It has also pointed out that the National Government possesses certain inherent powers⁷³ by virtue of its sovereign character. No state may invade these fields. These are the powers delegated to the United States which are referred to in the Tenth Amendment.

The powers prohibited to the states by the Constitution are found principally in Article I, Section 10, and in the Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Nineteenth amendments⁷⁴. By Article I, Section 10, the states are forbidden absolutely to enter into treaties, alliances or confederations; to grant letters of marque; to coin money; to emit bills of credit; to make anything but gold or silver coin tender in payment of debts; to pass bills of attainder, ex post facto laws or laws impairing the obligation of contracts; or to grant titles of nobility. They are also prohibited, except with the consent of Congress, from laying duties on imports or exports (with certain exceptions), from laying duties of tonnage, keeping troops or ships of war in time of peace, entering into agreements or compacts, or engaging in war. The Fourteenth Amendment forbids the making or enforcing of any state law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities⁷⁵ of citizens of the United States; the deprivation of any person of life, liberty or property without due process⁷⁶ of law; or the denial of equal protection of the laws⁷⁷. The Fifteenth and Nineteenth amendments restrain the power of the states to define the qualifications of electors by forbidding discrimination on the grounds of race, color, previous condition of servitude or sex. All of these things states may not do except upon the conditions specified in the Constitution. But all remaining powers of government are theirs.

The Supreme Court of the United States is the final arbiter in case of conflict between a state

Reserved Powers of the People

and the National Government over the right to exercise a governmental power. On occasion, as in the *Child Labor Cases*⁷⁸, the Court has declared acts of Congress invalid because they invaded the reserved powers of the states. On many other occasions state statutes have been declared void as invasions of the power of the National Government. Only by such a process may our Federal Union be preserved.

[Orth and Cushman, *American National Government*; J. M. Mathews, *The American Constitutional System*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Reserved Powers of the People. The Tenth Amendment reserves all powers not granted to the United States by the Constitution⁷⁹, nor prohibited by it to the states, to the states respectively or the people. It seems clear that the people referred to were the people of the several states, not the people of the United States. Thus viewed, the phrase "to the people" is a pronouncement of a political theory of popular sovereignty—a recognition of the right of the people to create and alter their state governments at will.

If the people of a state merely established a government, placing no limitations upon its powers, the legislative branch would possess all of the authority implied by the Tenth Amendment. But state constitutions commonly go much further than this. Bills of rights to protect the citizen of the state from his state government are found in every state constitution (*see* Bills of Rights, State). In many states the people have reserved to themselves the power to propose new laws through the initiative or to require the submission to popular vote of laws passed by the legislature through the referendum⁸⁰. As state constitutions grow longer, more and more subjects are removed from legislative competence and are made subject to alteration only by popular vote. Such reservations of power as these give content to the final phrase of the Tenth Amendment.

In another sense it may be said that the effect of the Amendment was to guarantee to the citizens of the states the continuation of the legal rights and duties which had been built up by the courts in the common law⁸¹. Or from still another point of view it is an embodiment in legal phraseology of the right of revolution⁸² asserted in the Declaration of Independence⁸³. Thus it may be interpreted as an effort on the part of the first Congress to suggest that each citizen might possess a sphere of privacy which should be inviolate from interference by his government. During the period of individualism in America this privacy was a reality in many areas of life. But in recent

years control, by both state and Federal governments, has become increasingly pervasive.

HARVEY WALKER

Resettlement Administration. Before 1933 agricultural economists had deplored the wasteful and destructive use to which much land was being put in the United States and had urged the adoption of certain controls in land use and the retirement from cultivation of badly eroded and submarginal lands. The conservation minded New Deal undertook to retire submarginal land as part of its agricultural adjustment program⁷⁰. The Resettlement Administration was created in 1935 to administer this land retirement program and to resettle the displaced farmers on other areas. It was also given responsibility for the efforts being made to enable tenants to become home owners. In 1937 the Resettlement Administration was transferred to the Department of Agriculture where it became the Farm Security Administration.

[*Land Policy Circular*, issued monthly since 1935 by the Department of Agriculture and the Resettlement Administration.]

PAUL WALLACE GATES

Residence Requirement. A definite, though varying, period of residence within the state, county and election precinct is required of all voters. State residence is commonly one year, never less than six months, and not longer than two years. County residence varies from ten days in Wisconsin to one year in four Southern states. Precinct residence ranges from one day in Maryland to one year in Mississippi.

Officeholders must also meet further residence requirements: members of Congress must be "inhabitants" of the state in which they are chosen; governors must have resided in the state from two to ten years; members of the state legislature are usually required to be residents of the state and districts from which they are chosen, the period ranging from one to seven years for state residence and from one to two years for district residence. County and other local officeholders are commonly required to be residents of the county or other local unit concerned; and city councilmen, of the wards from which they are elected.

[K. H. Porter, *History of Suffrage in the United States*, and Suffrage Provisions in State Constitutions, in *Amer. Pol. Sci. Rev.*, XIII; R. C. Brooks, *Political Parties and Electoral Problems*.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Resolutions, Legislative. Simple resolutions are those passed by, and affecting only, the body originating them; e.g., resolutions by which rules

of procedure are adopted, or committees are appointed. Two other classes of resolutions appear in Congress and many state legislatures: "concurrent resolutions," embodying agreements between the two Houses, not legislative in nature, and therefore not submitted to the President for approval; and "joint resolutions," which are really bills, in procedure are treated like bills, and, except for joint resolutions proposing constitutional amendments, are subject to executive veto.

Concurrent resolutions may declare the opinion or purpose of the legislature on some matter of policy; e.g., the Mathews Resolution of 1877, relating to the payment of government bonds in silver dollars; more commonly they deal with minor matters chiefly of concern to the Houses alone, such as calling upon the executive for information, ordering the printing of documents, authorizing appointment of joint committees, and fixing a date for adjournment. Concurrent resolutions are without force and effect beyond the confines of the Capitol.

Joint resolutions, on the other hand, are a form of subsidiary legislation and, therefore, require approval of both Houses and the executive. If approved, they have the full force of law. Such resolutions are used for "incidental, unusual, or inferior purposes of legislating"; e.g., to notify a foreign government of the abrogation of a treaty, to correct an error in a statute, to make special appropriations for minor and incidental purposes, and for a great variety of other purposes. Political considerations may determine whether a concurrent or a joint resolution shall be employed. In 1937 an unsuccessful attempt was made to convert a concurrent resolution condemning "sit-down" strikes⁷¹ into a joint resolution; the latter, requiring presidential action, would have forced the executive to depart from a position of neutrality on the subject. Whether a concurrent resolution may be employed in dealing with a matter legislative in nature, as a means of avoiding a presidential veto or repealing an executive order, was raised, though not decided, in Congress in 1938, during consideration of a government reorganization bill.

[A. C. Hinds, *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, Vol. IV, pp. 290-294; *Rules of the House of Representatives*, 75th Congress, 395-397; *Cannon's Precedents*, Vol. VII, pp. 149-170; *Senate Report No. 1335*, 54th Congress, 2nd Session; C. L. Jones, *Statute Law-Making in the United States*; R. Luce, *Legislative Procedure*; P. S. Reinsch, *American Legislatures and Legislative Methods*.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Resorts. The institution of the summer resort in America may be traced back to the colonial

period when Newport, R. I., was visited every summer by very considerable numbers (400 in the eight years preceding the Revolution) who came from the Southern colonies and the West Indies in search of health and amusement. The Revolution cut short this development and Newport did not again attain the status of a summer resort until the middle of the 19th century. By then it had a number of rivals. Saratoga Springs was the most important socially, drawing the fashionable from all over the country. Nahant, near Boston, was popular; in New Jersey there were Long Beach and Cape May; and the leading Southern resort was White Sulphur Springs in Virginia. "All the world is here," wrote Philip Hone, visiting Saratoga in 1839, "politicians and dandies; cabinet ministers and ministers of the gospel; officeholders and office seekers; humbuggers and humbugged. . . ."

Increasing wealth, greater leisure and improved means of transportation had led to this development of the summer resort in the first half of the 19th century; the next fifty years saw its further growth, as the cheaper transportation furnished by the railroads and the more general adoption of a two-weeks' summer vacation⁷ made resort life possible for a steadily increasing number of people. Newport now outpaced its rivals as the resort of society, but hundreds of other places attracted members of the business and professional classes. In the spring of 1890, the New York *Tribune* was publishing eight columns of summer resort notices, advertising the attractions of seashore or mountains, the available sports and other amusements, and the comforts and luxuries of the large, modernized resort hotels.

As time went on these hotels were supplemented by summer cottages, visitors returning annually for longer and longer stays, and vacation at some seashore or mountain resort became an integral feature of the recreational life of an ever larger number of people. It was a part of the general movement for outdoor sports, and New England especially made the most of its opportunities for building up a summer industry from the exploitation of its vacation resources.

In more recent years resorts of every kind, meeting the limitations of lower-salaried workers, have sprung up in every part of the country, but automobile touring, and the automobile camp, have somewhat cut in on the resort life of half a century ago.

FOSTER RHEA DULLES

"Restook War." See Aroostook War.

Restraining Acts. See Coercion Acts.

Restraint of Trade. The common-law roots of this legal doctrine antedate the Federal Constitution and even the settlement of the Western Hemisphere. In its technical meaning the phrase was originally confined to covenants, usually accompanying the sale of a business or instruction in a trade, whereby one of the parties engaged not to compete with the other. But, by the middle of the 18th century, the phrase "restraint of trade" came to have a wider meaning. It began to be applied to combinations entered into by workmen with a view to raising their wages. In England there were statutory bases for this development, but in America it represented simply a judicial extension of the common law doctrine of conspiracy (*see Philadelphia Cordwainers' Case*). With the development of the factory system and the attendant loss of bargaining power by individual employees, however, the courts recognized the expediency of sanctioning some voluntary restriction upon free competition in this sphere. Since the middle of the 19th century American courts (*see Commonwealth v. Hunt*) have generally declined to treat as "restraints of trade" labor confederacies which confine their efforts to securing voluntary adherence to agreed (noncompetitive) terms upon which employment will be accepted. Both at common law and under the Sherman Antitrust Law, even as amended by the Clayton Act⁸, however, trade unions may still be guilty of a restraint of trade when they endeavor to impose restrictions upon freedom of contract⁹ of third parties. This may occur as an incident of efforts to secure a closed shop¹⁰, as by demanding the discharge of non-union employees, thus restricting their employment opportunities. Or it may occur in conjunction with a boycott¹¹ of the products or facilities of an employer, his trade being "restrained" by depriving him of free access to the market.

In the last half of the 19th century the doctrine of restraint of trade came to be applied, also, to agreements among trade competitors looking toward control of the market. Such combinations might take the form of pools, joint sales agencies, trusts¹², or even corporate consolidations. These confederacies became, indeed, in the last quarter of the century, an increasingly common incident of trade rivalry. Responsive to popular demand, the courts condemned, as opposed to public policy, all trade agreements involving mutual engagements not to compete, regardless of their professed reasonableness. But under the common-law doctrine they were only void, i.e., unenforceable. They were not subject to criminal penalties. These penalties the Sherman Antitrust Law provided, as well as making

the offense subject to suppression by injunction⁷⁸. The effectiveness of this minatory law has varied in different periods and in application to different types of trade arrangements and industrial combinations. On the whole, the field of application (apart from labor organizations) in which it has been employed most effectively has been in reference to trade boycotts, or to confederated efforts of vested interests in various lines of business to defend "the regular channels of trade." But its efficacy, in general, as a means of preserving free competition and therewith the indispensable condition for a rational sanction by public authority of a private enterprise system has latterly come to be more and more questioned. Witness in this connection the National Recovery Administration⁷⁹ experiment of 1933-35, in which "restraints of trade" were validated wholesale under the euphemistic rubric of "rules of fair competition." But in this connection, also, there should not be overlooked the violent reaction to this lowering of the bars against restraint of trade.

[J. R. Commons and associates, *Documentary History of American Labor*, Vols. III and IV; Myron W. Watkins, *Industrial Combinations and Public Policy*; W. Z. Ripley, *Trusts, Pools and Corporations*; J. R. Commons and associates, *History of Labor in the United States*, Vols. I, II and III; A. M. Kales, *Contracts and Combinations in Restraint of Trade*.]

MYRON W. WATKINS

Resumption Act (1875). Late in 1861, due to conditions produced by the Civil War, specie payments were suspended in the United States. Shortly afterwards, early in 1862, the first issue of legal-tender notes, called greenbacks⁸⁰, was authorized (*see* Legal Tender Act). Before the end of the war, a total of \$431,000,000 in greenbacks had been issued, and authorization had been given for another \$50,000,000 in small denominations, known as fractional currency or "shin plasters"⁸¹.

During the period of Reconstruction⁸², a political struggle took place between the inflationists and the "sound money" men, thus preventing the early resumption of specie payments and retirement of the greenbacks. At the end of 1874 a total of \$382,000,000 of these notes was still in circulation. As a result of the Panic of 1873⁸³ the Republicans were defeated in the congressional elections of 1874. While they still had the necessary votes they hastened to pass the Resumption Act on Jan. 14, 1875. This law provided for the replacement, "as rapidly as practicable," of the Civil War fractional currency by silver coins. Provision was also made for reducing the greenback total to \$300,000,000. Most important of all, the Secretary of the Treasury was directed to

"redeem, in coin" legal-tender notes presented for redemption on and after Jan. 1, 1879. (*See also* Bland-Allison Act.)

The inflationists in 1878 succeeded in modifying this law by securing the enactment of a measure stopping the destruction of greenbacks when the total outstanding was \$346,681,000. The actual resumption of specie payments was carried out under the direction of Secretary of the Treasury John Sherman. Aided by the return of prosperity, he was able to accumulate gold to carry out the intent of the Resumption Act. But when people found greenbacks to be on a par with gold, they lost their desire for redemption, thus making possible complete success for the legislation.

[D. R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States; Statutes At Large*, Vol. 18.] ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Retaliation in International Law. It is questionable whether even an established illegal act by one belligerent⁸⁴ gives his enemy an absolute juridical right to retaliate by an illegal act of his own. International law⁸⁵ certainly would not condone any violations suffered by a neutral⁸⁶ arising out of resort to retaliation by one belligerent against his enemy. When such an initial and established violation of law leaves a belligerent faced with the immitigable problem of self-preservation, however, it is difficult to condemn without qualification resort to retaliation on his part. In practice retaliations have not usually been a matter of self-preservation but rather pretexts to use a more damaging but acknowledgedly illegal means of warfare.

Such was the case in four different European wars in which the neutral rights⁸⁷ of the United States have been vitally affected. In the European war of 1792 to 1801, in which England became involved in 1793, the British government maintained that the unusual mode of warfare employed by the enemy, in "having armed almost the whole laboring classes of the French nation for the purpose of commencing and supporting hostilities against the governments of Europe," was a justification for making foodstuffs contraband⁸⁸. During the Napoleonic wars, 1803-15, both sides embarked on a series of retaliatory decrees that defied all international law. These reached their climax in the Berlin and Milan decrees of Napoleon of 1806 and 1807 and British Orders in Council of 1807⁸⁹ and their subsequent refinements. The complete defiance of neutral rights by Great Britain, the belligerent which controlled the seas, was one of the causes of the War of 1812⁹⁰.

Such was the case also during the World War⁹¹

of 1914 to 1918. At the commencement of the conflict Great Britain accused Germany of strewing an illegal type of mine in the North Sea, and of other acts which justified her in proclaiming "military zones" in the North Sea into which neutral shipping would proceed at its own risk; soon Great Britain also declared all foodstuffs bound ultimately to Germany to be contraband. Germany retaliated to this with a submarine⁹⁰ blockade of England, omitting the required visit and search⁹¹ in order to attack without warning. England retaliated with the proclamation of "an effective cordon" against German imports, and later against German exports. This had all the effectiveness of a blockade⁹² without the legal requirements of one—so the neutral United States remonstrated. Disputes with Germany over the ensuing illegal submarine warfare eventually precipitated war between the United States and Germany.

During the European war that broke out in September, 1939, both belligerents began the same process of "retaliatory" acts against the enemy, each being eager to use its most deadly weapon for the defeat of his adversary and regardless of neutral rights except in so far as a neutral could make those rights respected. In this latest war, the withdrawal of American shipping from the area of maritime hostilities, and other provisions of the neutrality acts of 1935-39⁹³, have so far (1940) avoided acute controversies over neutral rights and the ensuing tendency to involve the United States in the war.

The English authority, Prof. J. L. Brierly, suggests that retaliation, at the discretion of a national executive, presents a problem impossible to solve by judicial means, and may well mean the vanishing point of international law.

[J. L. Brierly, *International Law in England*, *Law Quarterly Review*, January, 1935, pp. 24-35; Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Diplomatic History of the United States*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Reunion was a French colony established in 1854 near Dallas, Tex., by French Socialists who were followers of François Fourier under the immediate leadership of Prosper Victor Considerant, who explained that Reunion would serve as a center from which would radiate numerous lines leading to other colonies to be established by people who had imbibed the doctrines of Fourier⁹⁴. Some attempts were made in Houston, Tex., and one, by the purchase of 50,000 acres, at Uvalde, Tex., but, like Reunion, they were never successful. Some writers estimate that the population of Reunion reached 500, but a safe estimate would be approximately 300. The colony continued, with varying degrees of success

and failure, until 1867 when it was disbanded and its assets were distributed.

[Victor Prosper Considerant, *Au Texas, le premier Rapport à mes Amis*; W. J. Hammond, La Reunion, a French Colony in Texas, in *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. XVII, No. 2.]

WILLIAM J. HAMMOND

Revenue, The Public, is derived from three chief sources, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. The first of these is the extensive group of internal revenue, or excise, taxes levied on goods, functions or activities. Among these are the taxes on liquors, tobacco products, gasoline, automobiles, firearms, tickets of admission to athletic contests and theaters, and on the capital stock of corporations. Taxes collected under the social security acts⁹⁵ of 1935-37 are levied as excise taxes. These taxes are easily and quickly levied and collected, so it is especially advantageous to employ them in periods of emergency, such as wars.

The second chief source of Federal revenue is the tariff⁹⁶ on imports from abroad. (*See also* various articles on Customs.) Tariff duties, like internal revenue taxes, are imposed under the authority of Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States. The first tariff duties were levied in 1789. Since that time there have been numerous revisions of the tariff laws. Beginning especially with the tariff act of 1816, duties have been levied for the purpose not only of raising revenue but also of affording protection⁹⁷ to American industries. The Constitution forbids the taxing of exports and it also prohibits the giving of any preference "to the ports of one state over those of another."

Since 1913, when the Sixteenth Amendment was added to the Constitution, income and inheritance taxes⁹⁸ have been a third important source of Federal revenue. Income taxes were levied during the Civil War period and their validity was upheld in 1881 by the Supreme Court in the case of *Springer v. U. S.*⁹⁹. In 1894 Congress again levied income taxes but, in the following year, the Supreme Court, in the case of *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan and Trust Company*¹⁰⁰, found these taxes to be unconstitutional on the ground that they were direct taxes and therefore must be levied on the states in proportion to their population. This led to agitation which resulted in adding to the Constitution the Sixteenth Amendment which declares that "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

The following table indicates the growth of the public revenue, by ten-year periods:

1791	\$	4,409,000
1801		12,935,000
1811		14,422,000
1821		14,573,000
1831		28,867,000
1841		16,860,000
1851		52,555,000
1861		41,476,000
1871		374,431,000
1881		360,782,000
1891		392,612,000
1901		587,685,000
1911		701,372,000
1921		5,572,603,000
1931		3,189,638,632
1939		5,667,823,625

[David Rich Dewey, *Financial History of the United States; World Almanac, 1940.*]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Revere's Ride. Paul Revere, a Boston silversmith and a trusted messenger of the Massachusetts Committee of Safety, foreseeing an attempt of the British troops in Boston against the military stores collected in Concord, had arranged to signal a warning to the Whigs in Charlestown. In the late evening of April 18, 1775, he was told by Dr. Joseph Warren, chairman of the Committee of Safety, that the British were about to cross the river to begin their march to Concord. Revere signalled the fact by two lanterns (Longfellow's "two if by sea") hung by a friend from the tower of the North Church, probably the present Christ Church in Boston. Then, using a secreted boat, he managed to cross the river in spite of British patrols, and borrowing a horse in Charlestown, started for Concord. Blocked by British officers from the Cambridge road, he rode via Medford, alarming the country as he went. About midnight he arrived in Lexington, and at the house of the Rev. Jonas Clarke roused John Hancock and Samuel Adams, who were thus enabled to seek safety. Joined by William Dawes (sent by Dr. Warren via Roxbury) and by young Dr. Samuel Prescott of Concord, Revere then set forward with his news, only to be intercepted, a few miles farther on, by a patrol of British officers. Prescott leaped a fence and escaped, carrying the alarm to Lincoln and Concord. Dawes fled back toward Lexington; but Revere was taken. Assuring his captors that the country was roused against them, he so alarmed them that they set him free. He returned to Lexington, helped to save Hancock's papers, and saw the first shot fired on the green. Revere did not reach "the bridge in Concord

town," but his feat was of quite as great importance as Longfellow supposed.

[Revere's two statements are in MS. at the Massachusetts Historical Society, and are printed in *Old South Leaflet No. 222*, with comment by S. E. Morison. See also Elbridge H. Goss, *Life of Col. Paul Revere*; Allen French, *The Day of Concord and Lexington.*]

ALLEN FRENCH

Revised Version, THE (1885-1901). The 19th century saw important discoveries of New Testament manuscripts and an increased knowledge of Hebrew. These advances led to the most significant revision of the English Bible since the making of the King James revision in A.D. 1611. In February, 1870, the convocation of Canterbury initiated the revision movement. Large committees of scholars and ecclesiastics, including an American group, labored to establish a more accurate text and to clarify the language. This completed Revised Version was published in 1885.

Meanwhile, the American committee, dissatisfied with the recognition given its suggestions, maintained its organization and revised the British Revision closer to American needs. Its work was published in 1901 as the American Standard Revised Version. Both the British and the American Revisions were welcomed by the American public; hundreds of thousands of copies of the former were sold in an incredibly short period, but the American Standard has completely ousted its British predecessor from general use in this country, and is now the standard version for classroom use in seminaries and colleges, and steadily increases in general use. However, increased knowledge of language and manuscripts, and criticism of its literary quality resulted in the appointment, in 1929, of a new committee which is again revising the text.

[T. W. Chambers, *A Companion to the Revised Old Testament*; M. B. Riddle, *The Story of the Revised New Testament*; I. M. Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible.*]

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL

Revivals have occurred in America at frequent intervals from the early 18th century to the present. The Great Awakening⁹⁷, which marks the beginning of this type of religious activity, had three distinct phases: the New England, the Middle Colony and the Southern or Virginian. The New England revival began under the preaching of Jonathan Edwards in Northampton, Mass., in December, 1734, and continued in successive waves for nearly ten years. The entire Connecticut Valley was affected and from 25,000 to 50,000 members were added to the New England churches. The Middle Colony revival centered

at New Brunswick, N. J., as the result of the preaching of a group of young men who had been trained in William Tennent's "Log College"⁷⁰ at Neshaminy, Pa. It was largely a Presbyterian⁷¹ revival and resulted in greatly expanding the influence of that communion. The Southern or Virginian revival had also three distinct phases: a Presbyterian phase (1750-60) under the leadership of Samuel Davies; a Baptist phase (1760-70) under the leadership of two New England farmer-preachers; and a Methodist phase (1772-80), which marks the real beginning of Methodism in America. The connecting link between all these phases of the colonial Awakenings was George Whitefield, who made seven evangelistic tours of America, between 1738 and 1770, and ranged up and down the colonies from Maine to Georgia, working with all the evangelical churches.

The latter years of the 18th century were a period of religious deadness, to be followed by the Second Awakening⁷² (1797-1805) which swept the nation. This movement was particularly spectacular in the West. Here, in great out-door meetings, many people under great emotional strain were affected by strange physical exercises called the "jerks" and the "falling exercise." While adding tens of thousands to the frontier churches it also left some unfortunate results. The eastern phase of this revival began in the colleges and spread throughout that section. President Timothy Dwight of Yale College was the most conspicuous leader. From this time forward revivalism became the accepted method of work adopted by Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists and later the Disciples and its influence can be traced in the more conservative Lutheran and German Reformed bodies.

The outstanding pre-Civil War revivalist was Charles G. Finney⁷³ who had many imitators as well as critics. Lyman Beecher and his more famous son, Henry Ward Beecher, were revivalistic preachers as were all the more prominent preachers of the time. The Yale Divinity School, under the inspiration of Nathaniel W. Taylor, turned out a stream of revivalistic preachers for several student generations, and the denominational colleges⁷⁴ throughout the land were centers of revivalistic influence and effort.

An unusual revival began in 1857, as a result of a Wall Street panic, in a prayer meeting on Fulton Street in New York City, and soon the nation "was on its knees." It was in this quiet laymen's movement that Dwight L. Moody began his religious activities which in the years following the Civil War made him the outstanding revivalist of his time. The period of Moody's

activity as a revivalist covered the years from the close of the Civil War to his death in 1899. He, associated with his great song leader Ira D. Sankey, conducted meetings in every large city in the country, and held two great evangelistic campaigns in Great Britain (1873-75; 1881-84). Though a man without education and with no ecclesiastical organization back of him, Moody was probably the greatest single influence for religion in 19th-century America.

The last four decades in the history of revivalism may be fittingly termed the period of the professional evangelist. It was the period in which B. Fay Mills, Sam Jones, R. A. Torrey, J. Wilbur Chapman and "Billy" Sunday, to name only a few among the better-known revivalists, were occupying the center of the evangelistic stage. This type of revivalism was characterized by high-powered organizations, great tabernacles and the collection of large sums of money. Rev. William A. Sunday, the most conspicuous of these revivalists, was a converted baseball player who began his career as a professional evangelist in the 1890's. His greatest meetings were held from 1910 to 1920, but he continued active until his death in 1935.

Since 1920 this type of revivalism has been on the decline, though revivalistic methods are still extensively used, especially among the numerous pentecostal and holiness bodies. (See also Evangelism.)

[Joseph Tracy, *A History of the Revival of Religion in the Time of Edwards and Whitefield*, C. H. Maxson, *The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies*; W. M. Gewehr, *The Great Awakening in Virginia*; C. C. Cleveland, *The Great Revival in the West*; F. M. Davenport, *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals*; G. F. Wright, *Charles Grandison Finney*; Frank G. Beardsley, *A History of American Revivals*; W. W. Sweet, *Makers of Christianity*.]

WILLIAM W. SWEET

Revolution, American. It is the prevailing notion that the American Revolution was the direct result of a series of acts of the British government restricting, in important particulars, the freedom of the American colonies and designed at the same time to strengthen the hand of the home government in colonial control (see Colonial Policy, The British). The idea is essentially correct, but requires explanations and qualifications. Those acts of the British government commonly cited as causes of the Revolution did indeed, by their cumulative effect, provoke the colonies into revolt, yet these acts were rather the agencies that loosened political, economic and social forces long accumulating and long pent up. The genesis of the Revolution is therefore to be sought primarily in the conditions that had developed in the colonies through a long

period of years. What, in brief, had taken place was that the colonies, far separated from the mother country, thrown largely upon their own initiative, long accustomed to directing their own affairs, each according to its situation and its lights, had become imbued not only with a spirit of self-reliance, but with its necessary complement, a spirit of self-determination. Parental respect and affection abode with them still; parental guidance and protection, when needed, they continued to welcome; but let parental concern take on the character of excessive parental domination, and resentment would inevitably ensue; and resentment might easily grow into revolt. It was just such a development that brought on the Revolution. England and her American colonies had grown apart. Economic interests had diverged; political and social ideas had taken different trends. In consequence the bonds that bound the colonies to the mother country had become attenuated, and no great strain was required to break them. The attempt of Great Britain to assert a greater degree of control over the colonies furnished that strain. As these conditions manifested themselves, however, only in the presence of definite provocations, so the provocations find their full interpretation only in their relation to these undercurrents of colonial life.

When we consider the years preceding the Revolution, we seem to perceive this growth of a colonial consciousness of self-sufficiency reaching something like a climax with the close, in 1763, of the long rivalry between England and France, a rivalry that had had always its American phases, involving the colonies in dangers and in consequent measures of defense. This last war (*see* French and Indian War) in particular had been fought to determine whether French or English should be master of the American continent. Victorious England was now in possession not only of Canada on the north, whence had come threats of French aggression, but also of the vast region to the westward, which the French had sought to colonize, but upon which the English colonies had long cast covetous eyes. There followed a sense of relief from danger, of freedom to pursue their own ways, and a turning of the eyes toward the west with an ever greater yearning. Without being quite aware of it, the colonies straightway set out upon a march that, in a dozen years, was to bring them to the verge of separation from the maternal leading-strings.

Even before the events of 1763 had given their new and powerful impulse to the thought that British-America should be master in its own house, voices had been heard that carried the

self-same note. There was, for instance, that notable speech of James Otis of Boston, in 1761, against writs of assistance⁷, of which John Adams later declared that "then and there the child Independence was born." Adams was in error, as have been many who have come after him, in assuming that the child Independence, in the sense meant by him, really had a birthday. The child just grew. This is not to maintain that it could not have failed to grow. It was the diet. Much the same may be said of the utterance of Patrick Henry in the famous Parson's Cause⁸, some two years later. The voices of Otis and Henry were in essential unison in that each in his way had proclaimed the doctrines of government—not new doctrines in the world by any means—that the colonies would presently grasp as their main weapons of defense.

It is not to be overlooked that there was also a British side to the picture. Great Britain had become an empire, an empire stretching across all the seas and embracing many peoples of many modes of thought and practice. That empire must needs be defended and strengthened, and, what was of the utmost importance, its unity must somehow be preserved. It was primarily upon the ways and means of promoting these purposes that Great Britain and her colonies clashed. This problem of imperial organization, which was of such vital consequence to Great Britain, was for the moment of little concern to the colonies; yet, when at long last they had gained their independence and upon them, in turn, devolved the task of laying the foundations of a nation, it was upon the proper solution of just such a problem that in great measure depended the nation's future. Indeed, from first to last, it was the failure of mutual understanding and sympathy that brought upon the two great branches of the British empire their mutual woes.

The trouble began when, in 1764, the British ministry decided, quite reasonably, that it was necessary to maintain a small military force in the colonies for their defense (*see* Billeting), and, also quite reasonably, that the colonies ought to bear at least a part of the expense. The colonies, on their part, objected to anything like a standing army; they objected also to contributing toward its upkeep; but most of all they objected to the methods adopted for raising the necessary revenue. One of the means was by a more rigid enforcement of the Navigation Acts⁹, hitherto more breached than observed by the colonists. This was annoying enough, but when the Sugar Act¹⁰, forbidding the colonies to trade with the French and Dutch West Indies, fol-

lowed, colonial exasperation boiled over. But worse was yet to come. So far only the commercial colonies were affected. The withers of the Southern colonies had not been wrung. It was the Stamp Act⁷, passed early in 1765, proposing to collect internal taxes in all the colonies, that stirred a storm of protest throughout their length and breadth, a protest that did not limit itself to words, but employed also measures of forcible resistance. At this distance of time the act would not seem to have been particularly obnoxious in character, for a similar law was then in force in Great Britain, and one of the colonies, Massachusetts, had of its own accord adopted a like measure. But the colonies did not like it, and the keenest colonial minds set to work to evolve good reasons for their dislike of it. The good reason evolved was that it was taxation without representation⁸, and that, they asserted, was contrary to the spirit of the English constitution⁹. Their own colonial assemblies¹⁰, in which they were represented, might lay taxes, yes; but the British Parliament, in which they were not represented, no. But, ran the British argument, that principle of the constitution means no taxation without representation in the House of Commons, and the colonies, as all other British peoples, were represented in the House of Commons. No, replied the colonies, we do not vote for representatives in the House of Commons, therefore we are not represented in that lawmaking body. And the more they argued over what constituted representation, the more they disagreed, with the result that the knot could be untied only by the Alexandrian method. In addition to fixing in the colonial mind the idea of fundamental colonial rights and the basis of them, the agitation against the Stamp Act had the result of stimulating efforts to bring the colonies together into some sort of unified organization. One such effort took the form of promoting Associations¹¹, or boycotts of English goods. Another resulted in the Stamp Act Congress¹², designed to unite the colonies more effectually in their resistance to the British policies. The final outcome of the agitation was to convince the British authorities that discretion was the handmaiden of wisdom, and the act was repealed. For a little while everybody seemed happy; but not for long.

The author of the Stamp Act and its associated measures, George Grenville, was followed in the ministry by Charles Townshend, who, in his turn, took a look at the colonial problem, and, having observed that the colonies had indicated a willingness to accept external taxation designed for the regulation of trade, decided that the solu-

tion would be to give them external taxes. The Townshend Acts¹³ (1767) not only provided for raising a revenue by means of certain import duties, they also set up measures of control that touched the colonies in exceedingly sensitive spots. If, in that matter of external taxation, the American expounders of the English constitution seemed for a moment to have been hoist on their own petard, it was only for a moment. Without more than a momentary hesitation, they shifted their platform from "no taxation without representation" to "no legislation without representation." In fact, one of the most notable of the protests against the Stamp Act, the resolutions fathered by Patrick Henry in the Virginia House of Burgesses, had scarcely fallen short of proclaiming that very doctrine. The clamor that had arisen against the Stamp Act was scarcely more than a rehearsal beside that which now arose against the Townshend Acts. External in hue and color these new measures might be, but any measure, contended the colonists, that created an expense was in essence a tax. Away with it! Accordingly all the means of protest and resistance employed against the Stamp Act, violent as well as peaceful, were brought into play, including that formidable weapon, nonimportation¹⁴. The result was that once again the British government retreated and repealed the acts; that is, all except the tax on tea¹⁵. Enter that stubborn monarch, George the Third, who wished to maintain the parliamentary right in question, as he also sought, in season and out of season, to uphold the royal authority. As in the case of the Stamp Act, resistance to the Townshend Acts had led to proceedings in the colonies that were to have consequential importance, notably, for one thing, the Massachusetts Circular Letter¹⁶ (1768), fathered by Samuel Adams, designed to bring the colonies into closer co-operation in resisting British policies and containing more-over the declaration that there was no aim at independence; and, for another, the Virginia resolves¹⁷ of the following year, which included a forceful statement of the constitutional principles upon which the rights claimed by the colonies were based. In each case the proceeding resulted, on the one hand, in the dissolution of the assembly concerned, and, on the other, in enthusiastic responses from the other colonies.

The repeal of the Townshend Acts once again brought a lull in the colonies, and the lull might have developed into real peace and quiet, if the temperature of colonial heads had entirely subsided, and if some British heads had not forgotten their lessons. It was just one more instance of British ineptness that sullied the fair prospect;

a decision, and for a reason that had little or nothing to do with the colonial problem, to make use of the Tea Act. The importation of cargoes of tea led to the famous Boston Tea Party⁷⁰, and to several other tea parties⁷¹ as well, quite as significant if not so famous; and the Boston Tea Party naturally stirred the British authorities to take punitive action against that nest of sedition called Boston. There followed a group of repressive measures, termed by the colonists, the Intolerable Acts⁷², most noteworthy among them being that for closing the port of Boston. The Quebec Act⁷³, passed about the same time, was in no sense punitive in its intent, but it was interpreted by the colonies as designed to cut them off from the rich western territory, and their wrath was increased accordingly.

If Great Britain had been swift to punish, the colonies were just as swift to take measures for the defense of their precious rights. It was now that committees of correspondence⁷⁴ sprang into luxuriant growth, with the result that the colonies speedily became well informed of one another's feelings and doings. Likewise it soon became evident that the other colonies would come to the support of the afflicted Massachusetts; for, so they reasoned, the fate of one colony would in all probability ultimately be the fate of all. Out of this network of committees (*see Revolutionary Committees*) speedily arose the suggestion that a general congress of the colonies be assembled to concert and agree upon measures for the redress of their grievances and the maintenance of their rights. The outcome was the assembling in Philadelphia in September, 1774, of what has come to be known as the First Continental Congress⁷⁵.

Thenceforward the Continental Congress became the focus of the whole Revolutionary movement, for by this time it was becoming tolerably clear that something like a revolution was under way. Eagerly as most of the colonies had espoused the cause of Massachusetts as their own, when, in their congress, they sought to concert and agree, they found themselves wide apart with regard to ways and means, and not at all in agreement as to the ends. Some would yield not a jot nor a tittle to British contentions, others were disposed to compose the differences, while still others chose, at nearly all hazards, to avoid breaking with the established government. What the Congress actually did was to adopt a declaration of rights⁷⁶ and grievances, an Association or boycott of British goods, and to propose the assembling of a second Congress in the following May, in the event that their grievances had not meanwhile been redressed. The interval was any-

thing but a time of idling, for the local committees were busily occupied in enforcing the Association.

As May, 1775, approached, no sign of redress had become evident; on the contrary, the conflict had become intensified, for an actual clash of arms had taken place at Lexington and Concord⁷⁷ (April 19); and, within little more than a month after the assembling of the Congress, had come the bloody battle of Bunker Hill⁷⁸. The instructions to most of the delegates, drawn before the events of April, had spoken of the restoration of harmony as a chief objective of the Congress; but unexpectedly the Congress found itself with a war on its hands. To all appearances redress of grievances would be obtained only by force of arms, and a very different sort of harmony would have to be sought for. Congress had no mandate to conduct a war; it had no mandate even to constitute itself into a government; but it was the only body in existence that to any degree embodied the wills of the several colonies, and there was no time to wait for advice or instructions. Accordingly, Congress rose to the occasion and with no ado assumed the powers of government. It proceeded to advise, to plan, and even to instruct; it organized an army (*see Revolutionary Army*), appointed the chief officers, and then, to meet the costs, it issued its own promises to pay (*see Revolution, Financing of the*). Without so much as a yea or a nay, Congress had appropriated to itself most of the attributes of sovereignty⁷⁹, and ere long it would become as jealous of its dignity and authority, such as it was, as the old Parliament itself.

The question might well have been asked at the outset—and Congress did in time ask itself that question—whether it was the part of wisdom to enter upon a test of strength with such a power as Great Britain with no more unity than was manifest in a heterogeneous body of representatives, of uncertain powers and uncertain tenure, with no directive authority anywhere except as might be uttered in a majority vote of the colonies represented. Such an arrangement could but give rise to deep dissatisfactions and put a premium upon hesitancy and inefficiency. And what greatly added to the inefficiency of Congress as an agency for directing such a contest was the deep-seated fear of an efficient government that permeated the colonies. At the very bottom of the controversy was an antagonism to increased efficiency on the part of the home government, and it was a like antagonism in the main that was responsible for the persistent refusal of the states to equip their congress with adequate powers for carrying on the war and for other neces-

sary business of an efficient government. Indeed, Congress itself exhibited the same watchful jealousy toward the army of its own creation, fearing lest the creature might turn and rend its creator, as it likewise did in long refusing to delegate important executive functions.

The first few months of the contest, whether it be measured for its military accomplishments or for the progress of other phases of the Revolutionary movement, were in great part a period of marking time. Not that the wheel of revolution stood still; for there were efforts to thrust it forward, as there were also efforts to turn it backward. Both contestants were manœuvring for advantage. On the colonial side there was as yet indecision whether to provoke a battle or listen to voices of conciliation. They had, in a manner, joined hands, but a complete unison of minds was lacking. Strangely enough, there was a hesitancy, in some quarters almost a repugnance, toward any effective bond of union. This was made particularly evident when, in July, Congress declined to give serious heed to a form of confederation which Franklin had proposed. There was, however, probably another reason. It was just then that the moderates were prevailing with their plea to offer the king one more humble petition, an "Olive Branch"⁷⁰.

The spell of hesitating and waiting came to an end when it was learned that not only had the king refused to accept their olive branch, but had proclaimed the colonies in a state of rebellion and had declared that he would use the might of his realm to bring them to obedience. And, worse yet, it appeared that he was preparing to go outside his realm for a part of his might by hiring some Hessians⁷¹ to fight his battles. The colonies had from the beginning, even if at times with tongue in cheek, professed loyalty to the king, firing their arrows of criticism the while at a vicious and stupid Parliament and a wicked ministry; but from this time on they disliked King George the Third immensely. The Congress even had a long debate one day in March, 1776, whether they might not be better advised to charge the king, instead of the ministry, with being "the author of their miseries," a sentiment that Thomas Paine's pamphlet, *Common Sense*⁷², published in early January, was doing much to cultivate. The proposition was not then accepted, but soon, very soon, Congress would be ready to charge King George with all manner of high crimes and misdemeanors.

For by this time colonial thought was moving rapidly toward acceptance of independence. The idea of independence, but a half-suppressed whisper in the summer and early autumn of

1775, had, by the spring of 1776, attained to cyclonic volume and force. In a few short weeks the demand for independence would sweep down upon a faltering Congress and swiftly demolish every other plea and every other argument in its mighty onrush. Not a little of the tempest's force is to be ascribed to that same pamphlet *Common Sense*, whose scathing denunciation and ridicule of the royal person had so effectively turned the wrath of the colonies upon their sovereign lord and master, King George. Even more effectually Paine persuaded Americans to set independence as their one true goal, the goal of peace, happiness and greatness for which they yearned. On the 15th of May the Virginia Convention instructed the delegates of that colony to offer in Congress a resolution for independence; the motion was made on June 7, and on July 2 every colony except New York cast its vote for the resolution. On the fourth of July, the formal Declaration of Independence⁷³ was adopted; and a few days later the New York delegates also gave their assent. For weal or for woe the die was cast.

These were culminations on the central stage; in the meantime, however, another phase of the Revolution was in process in what were now the independent states. The royal governments in the several colonies had, in fact, long since almost entirely broken down, and Provincial Congresses⁷⁴ or Conventions had taken their places. In mid-July, 1775, Congress had advised the colonies to organize committees of safety to serve as governments when the congresses or conventions were not in session; and a little later it was suggested to three of them (New Hampshire, South Carolina and Virginia) that they might do well to establish their own governments (*see Republic*). Now, when independence began to loom over the horizon like a threatening storm cloud, all the colonies were counseled to complete their own governmental organizations (May 10, 15). It is to that process, begun at once and actively continued through much of the Revolutionary period, that we must look for many of the significant results of the Revolution; for, although the creation of an efficient government of the United States in their collective capacity would be a consummation of supreme importance, it was in the individual states that new social and political ideas were to bear their most important fruit.

As for the great Common Cause, that was now independence; nothing less and, until that should be won, nothing more. Ceased now all clamor about rights and grievances, ceased also much of the declamation about the nature and

principles of government; much, though not all; for they would have to set up some sort of government for their United States, even if only for the duration of the war. The colonies knew and their Congress knew that to win independence they would have to fight, and that to fight effectively they would need to be bound to one another with stronger bonds than the fragile ties that then held them together. So well had this fact been recognized that the formation of a confederation had been one of the elements embodied in the resolution for independence. Not less strong was the conviction that they would need outside aid; therefore the same resolution called for a plan of foreign treaties (*see* Revolution, Diplomacy of the). Both projects were immediately set on foot, but it was long before either attained to its chief aim. Commissioners sent to France were able to obtain some aid secretly, but for an alliance with that power they had to await a favorable turn of events. Meanwhile, Congress strove mightily through many months and with much anguish of spirit to formulate an instrument of union, but it was not until Nov. 15, 1777, that it was able to reach an agreement upon the content of that instrument—the Articles of Confederation⁹⁷. It was still necessary to obtain the ratifications of all thirteen states, and most of the states found it unsatisfactory. In fact, it was not until March 1, 1781, that the last of the thirteen states, Maryland, was prevailed upon to give her assent.

It was while the states were hesitating over the Articles of Confederation that the commissioners in France were enabled at last to effect treaties of alliance and commerce with that power (Feb. 6, 1778); for it was not until the victory over Gen. Burgoyne⁹⁸ in the preceding October that the French government had become willing to risk espousing the American cause (*see* Franco-American Alliance of 1778). Learning of this alliance, the British government decided to be beforehand with France, if possible, by offering the one-time British colonies terms of conciliation such as had never been offered before. Accordingly there was something of a race between Great Britain's offer of conciliation and the French treaty, which should reach Congress first. Had the British commissioners (*see* Peace Commission of 1778), bearing the proposals of conciliation, arrived first, the subsequent story of the American Revolution might have been different. But the French treaty won the race. To Congress, then (May 2, 1778) sitting at York, Pa., and in the dark shadow of what appeared to be almost certain defeat, the alliance with France was as a boon from Heaven. Many an-

other dark shadow would fall upon that assembly of delegates before it would be able to emerge from the struggle victorious, but for the moment it was basking in the bright noonday sun. With the aid of France they were bound to win. Their exultant mood was abundantly manifest when, closely following the French treaty, came the British commissioners on conciliation bound. Short of complete independence, they offered practically everything that the Americans had ever asked for; but they had come too late, and they were accordingly bidden, in terms none too polite, to depart.

The alliance with France brought the much needed aid of money, men and ships, an aid so essential that without it the cause would doubtless have been lost; but the alliance also brought to Congress its full quota of troubles and responsibilities, not the least of which, as the contest dragged wearily on, were some pointed queries propounded in 1779 by the French minister, Gérard. To what lengths, queried Gérard, were the United States prepared to go in the prosecution of the war? When it came to a peace settlement—and most certainly the time would come when the United States, France and Great Britain would gather around the peace-table—what would the ultimata of the United States then be? These were most vexatious questions, and Congress spent many weary months debating them. Foremost of them was of course that respecting boundaries. That was of vital concern to all the states. Then there was the question of the free navigation of the Mississippi River, of especial interest to the Southern states. But, rather strange to tell, the question that stirred the bitterness of all the long and bitter wrangles was whether the United States should refuse to make peace unless the New Englanders were allowed to retain their old fishing privileges on the northeastern coast. Here was fuel in abundance for the fires of sectionalism, and the fires were kindled. Later, when the war, as it turned out, was actually drawing to a close, the new French minister, La Luzerne, prodded Congress with another exceedingly vexatious question: Would Congress instruct its peace negotiators to take no important steps without full consultation with the minister of his Most Christian Majesty? And Congress, sorely distressed and heavily pressed, deemed it the part of wisdom to answer yes. When peace-making time was at hand, however, the American negotiators arrogated to themselves a modicum of the fund of wisdom and broke the congressional injunction. To this day historians of that eventful episode dispute over the question whether Congress or

its commissioners had the larger share of that fund.

From the virtual termination of the war (*see* Yorktown Campaign), in the closing months of 1781, two years elapsed before the final consummation of the peace (*see* Definitive Treaty of Peace, 1783); and, strange almost beyond the power of comprehension, many Americans appeared to have all but lost interest in that consummation which would place the United States of America among the nations of the world. The states seemed to be saying, "Great Britain has at last withdrawn from us her heavy, noxious hand; we are individually free and independent states; why worry more?" It was only with the greatest difficulty that a sufficient representation could be gathered in Congress to ratify the treaty of peace (Jan. 14, 1784); but it was done. The independence of the United States of America was at long last a recorded fact. A question of even greater import, nevertheless, remained as yet unanswered. Now that the American states had their independence, what would they do with it? It was a hard lesson they had set for them; yet in time they would master it. (For the military phases of the Revolution *see* article, Revolutionary War, The; also various articles on separate battles and campaigns.)

[G. E. Howard, *Preliminaries of the Revolution, 1763-1775*; C. H. Van Tyne, *The American Revolution, 1776-1783, Causes of the American Revolution and The War of Independence*; Edward Channing, *History of the United States*; Allan Nevins, *The American States during and after the Revolution*; Carl Becker, *The Eve of the Revolution*; G. O. Trevelyan, *The American Revolution*; Randolph G. Adams, *Political Ideas of the American Revolution*; J. Franklin Jameson, *The American Revolution Considered as a Social Movement*.]

EDMUND C. BURNETT

Revolution, Diplomacy of the. The revolt of the British colonies in North America became almost instantly a factor in the European international situation. France, prostrated by Great Britain in the French and Indian War, had been compelled at the Peace of Paris (1763)⁹⁹ to give up her colonial ambitions and to accept a secondary role in European affairs. The revolt of the colonies was France's opportunity to intervene on the side of the insurrectionists—at first secretly, then openly by treaty—in order to split apart the British Empire, and, by abasing the power of Great Britain, proportionately to raise that of France. Before any agent of the revolted colonies set foot on the soil of France, the government of that monarchy, acting under the direction of the Comte de Vergennes and the impulsion of the playwright courier, Beaumarchais, had adopted a policy of secret assistance in munitions and money (*see*

Franco-American Alliance of 1778). The revolted colonies, on their side, hoped for intervention by France without even pledging themselves as allies.

Before the Declaration of Independence, the Continental Congress sent Silas Deane to France to seek secret assistance. After independence was proclaimed, an American diplomatic commission to France was composed of Benjamin Franklin, Deane and Arthur Lee (*see* France, American Joint Commission to). Vergennes received them informally but not officially. He continued a policy of watchful waiting and secret assistance through 1777, until, following Burgoyne's surrender⁹⁹ at Saratoga, Great Britain made peace overtures on the basis of home rule within the Empire (*see* Peace Commission of 1778). To prevent a reconciliation, France made the alliance and treaties of Feb. 6, 1778, which brought her openly into the war. France wanted a triple alliance with Spain; but Spain preferred to enter the war in 1779 on the basis of a separate alliance (*see* Aranjuez, The Convention of) with France alone (Gibraltar was Spain's price); she feared the example, on her own American colonies, of recognition of the independence of the United States.

The Netherlands became involved in the war over the question of neutral rights, and most of the neutral states of Europe joined the Armed Neutrality⁹⁹ of 1780 as at least an expression of protest against British naval practice on the high seas. Great Britain thus found herself isolated, diplomatically, and, after Cornwallis' surrender (*see* Yorktown Campaign), confronted by another military disaster in America. Opposition in Parliament to further prosecution of the war forced a salvaging of the empire on the basis of American independence, precisely the object of the Franco-American alliance (*see* Definitive Treaty of Peace, 1783).

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Diplomacy of the American Revolution*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Revolution, Financing of the, was, because of colonial hatred of any form of taxation, one of the most difficult tasks that faced the Continental Congress⁹⁹. Following hostilities at Bunker Hill, an issue of \$2,000,000 in bills of credit⁹⁹ was voted, based on the credit of the states. Unsatisfactory as this method proved, Congress continued until Nov. 29, 1779, to emit paper money to the amount of \$241,552,380, to be redeemed by the states. Depreciation set in shortly, and by March, 1780, in spite of legal-tender laws and an attempt to fix prices, the value of continental currency in silver had fallen to forty to one.

Debtors pursued their creditors and "paid them without mercy," according to a contemporary sufferer; prices rose to unheard of heights; while excessive speculation and counterfeiting demoralized the whole financial structure of the struggling colonies. "Not worth a Continental"^u became a phrase of derision and stark reality.

A system of direct requisitions on the states for corn, beef, pork and other supplies, was resorted to in 1780, but proved equally discouraging, for it lacked an efficient plan of assessment and record. Other means used to obtain funds included domestic and foreign loans; quartermaster, commissary and purchasing agent certificates; lotteries^u; and prize money^u received from the sale of captured enemy vessels. Domestic loans were offered for sale from time to time at high rates of interest, and although \$63,289,000 was subscribed, its real value was but a small percentage of that amount. Certificates of purchasing agents were used extensively in payment of supplies for the army, and Hamilton estimated in 1790 that they were outstanding to the amount of \$16,708,000. Foreign loans secured from France, Spain and Holland through the influence of Franklin and John Adams proved invaluable. French loans from 1777 to 1783 amounted to \$6,352,500; Spanish loans, to \$174,017; and Dutch loans, to \$1,304,000—making a total of \$7,830,517. These, and an outright gift from France made largely through the agency of Beaumarchais in the first years of the war, did much to strengthen colonial morale and finance (see Franco-American Alliance of 1778).

On Feb. 20, 1781, Robert Morris was appointed by Congress to the new office of Superintendent of Finance. He brought some order out of the existing chaos, but was hampered by local jealousies, continued state refusal to levy taxes, and by inadequate financial provisions of the Articles of Confederation^u. It remained for the new Constitution^u and the financial genius of Hamilton (see Assumption of, and Funding of, Revolutionary Debt) to place the United States on a firm national and international credit basis. The cost of the Revolution in gold has been estimated at:

Paper money	\$41,000,000
Certificates of indebtedness	16,708,000
Loan-office certificates	11,585,000
Foreign loans	7,830,000
Taxes (requisitions on states)	5,795,000
Gifts from abroad	1,996,000
Miscellaneous receipts	856,000
State debts	18,272,000
	<hr/>
	\$104,042,000

[Davis R. Dewey, *Financial History of the United States*; Harold U. Faulkner, *American Economic History*; R. V. Harlow, *Aspects of Revolutionary Finance, 1775-1783*, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXXV.] ELIZABETH WARREN

Revolution, The Navy in. The Continental Navy had its origin Oct. 13, 1775, when Congress appointed a Naval Committee of three to purchase two vessels. On Oct. 30 Congress ordered two more vessels purchased, and added four members to the committee. This Naval Committee laid the foundations of the navy. In November, 1775, it purchased the four vessels authorized: the *Alfred*, *Columbus*, *Andrew Doria* and *Cabot*; on Nov. 5 it appointed Esek Hopkins commander in chief; on Nov. 10 two battalions of marines were provided for; on Nov. 23 it formulated regulations for the navy based on current British practice; and on Dec. 22 submitted to Congress a list of eighteen officers already appointed. On Nov. 25 Congress provided for admiralty courts^u and the sale of captured vessels, and on Dec. 13 it authorized the construction of thirteen frigates. The next day it appointed a Marine Committee which superseded the Naval Committee. The Marine Committee was superseded in 1779 by a Board of Admiralty, but in 1781 this board was abolished and Robert Morris was made Agent of Marine in charge of naval affairs, a position held by him until the close of the war.

During the Revolution the naval vessels were employed principally in seizing British supply ships and merchantmen, the transport of munitions from France and the carriage of diplomatic agents and despatches to and from Europe. In May, 1777, Capt. Lambert Wickes with three small vessels made a spectacular raid in the Irish Channel, and in August-September, 1779, Commodore John Paul Jones made his celebrated cruise round Great Britain, ending in the capture of the *Serapis* (see *Bonhomme Richard* and *Serapis*, Engagement between the). The greatest service that the navy performed, however, was on Lake Champlain, at Valcour Island^u, when Benedict Arnold in October, 1776, fought a delaying action which effectually prevented a British invasion in 1776, contributing to American success at Saratoga^u in 1777. During the war the navy employed 260 naval officers, 124 marine officers and 73 vessels of all descriptions. Due to capture, sale and shipwreck, but one of these vessels, the frigate *Alliance*, remained in 1785.

[C. O. Paullin, *The Navy of the American Revolution*; G. W. Allen, *A Naval History of the American Revolution*.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Revolution, The Right of, made its first appearance in America as part of the philosophy of natural rights^o. The power of the New England congregations to discipline and depose their officers and ministers had earlier been asserted in the church platforms. At the same time the philosophy of the theocrats^o was so permeated with the dogma of Divine Right that this power was denied in practice. But the newer currents of thought which crossed the Atlantic after 1688 brought the idea of John Locke^o that a dissolution of government takes place not by any hostile act of the people but by the usurpations of those to whom authority has been delegated. It is the legislature or the executive acting contrary to the trust imposed in them that brings about the dissolution of government. Then and there arises the right of revolution whereby the people repossess themselves of their powers in order to delegate them into other hands. Locke thought that the right of revolution ought not to be exercised for light and transient causes, and that all changes should require the assent of a majority of the people. But, like all the natural-rights philosophers, he left a fruitful source of debate in the unanswered question who should judge between the people and the government. By the time of the American Revolution the theory of popular sovereignty embraced clearly the idea that the people have the right to alter their government. The right of revolution was identified with civil liberty^o, as "a power existing in the people at large, at any time, for any cause, or for no cause but their own sovereign pleasure, to alter or annihilate both the mode and essence of any former government, and adopt a new one in its stead." Thomas Jefferson regarded with composure the prospect of frequent recourse to the right of revolution in order that the free spirit of the people might not be suppressed. But the Constitution^o provides an orderly means of change in the government. Hence revolution is now applied to the process of effecting changes outside the Constitution. An example of this is secession^o, which was described by Robert E. Lee as "nothing but revolution." The terms constitutional and revolutionary are mutually exclusive; a political act cannot be revolutionary and at the same time be within the Constitution.

[C. E. Merriam, *History of American Political Theories*.]

WILLIAM S. CARPENTER

Revolutionary Army. A few days before the battle of Bunker Hill (June 17, 1775), the Continental Congress^o took over the force blockading Boston and called it the Continental army. Washington was appointed Commander in Chief,

Revolutionary Army

June 14, and hastened to Cambridge, taking command July 3.

The first problem before him was to train officers and men in the rudiments of military discipline. The army was composed of "rough and ready" farmers and mechanics whose conduct was decidedly colored by the personal independence of the frontier. Often the men elected their own officers, and in the early days there was practically no line drawn between officers and enlisted men. Washington said "they regarded an officer no more than a broomstick." Discipline and efficiency in the army were largely the work of von Steuben who began his drill-work in March, 1778.

The army consisted of two distinct elements: the Continentals organized by Congress, and the militia^o of the states. The militia were enlisted for three, six, or nine months, although the men were always ready to serve for a few weeks unless their "services were required far from their homes." Brave and able, these men were not efficient and were unfit for long periods of inactive camp life or garrison duty.

The Continentals were enrolled for one year or longer and were more thoroughly trained. Washington pleaded for long-term enlistments, for he knew that a standing army could not be properly trained in a year. Congress offered bounties^o to those serving in the regular forces, but some states offered higher bounties. Before long the bounties were so high that \$200 was an average bonus. In paper money, a soldier insisted on \$1000 and "in Virginia even twelve thousand dollars could not always buy a soldier." The states passed draft laws to recruit the militia, even imposing fines and imprisonments, penalties Congress could not impose. In Maryland, one of Washington's recruiting officers was arrested for enlisting two men for the artillery.

No accurate figures are available as to the number of men who served. The rolls indicate that altogether there were 231,771 in the Continental army, and 164,087 in the militia. The forces Washington commanded varied from 8000 during the struggle about New York, to as low as 4000 after the winter at Valley Forge^o, to as high as 26,000 in November, 1779. Other generals seldom had more than 6000.

Desertion^o was common and difficult to combat. Washington once wrote: "We shall have to detach one half the army to bring back the other." Officers were known to have urged their men to desert in order to find an excuse to follow them. There were plowing, corn to hoe, hay and grain to harvest, sick families, or they were "neglected, starving and freezing." Cold weather

brought on the "terrible disorder of Homesickness." Hunger, nakedness and pay in depreciated currency took a heavy toll.

The army used all sorts of guns—many were homemade. The firelock musket and the smooth-bore gun were most common. The sharpshooters from the frontier used the rifle⁹⁰ which was of greater range than any the British had. The musket was loaded from the muzzle and fired by the flintlock. In the main most of the arms came from abroad.

Powder and lead were scarce, and since the firearms were not uniform, soldiers melted lead and cast it in their own bullet-molds. The cartridge used was a paper envelope which held the charge of ball and powder, and after emptied of its contents was used as a wad, and pushed into the barrel with a ramrod.

There was a decided lack of artillery. Cannon were captured from the royal arsenals and the British army. Some crude ones were homemade but were unpopular with the army. France and Holland were the chief sources of supply.

The need of transport was also serious. Naturally the colonials used the water routes for moving supplies any great distance. Vehicles were scarce while roads were few and bad. There were not enough oxen or horses and sometimes the privates were used as beasts of burden. Farmers were loath to sell supplies for depreciated money—often worthless paper. Engineers were too few to build enough roads, bridges and forts, while the deficiency in maps was somewhat compensated by the officers' intimate knowledge of the country.

Inadequate transport was serious in the case of food and clothing, and often the army was starving in a land of plenty. Soldiers went without meat for an entire week, and in winter the horses and oxen died for want of forage and care. There is a grim humor to the phrase, "no pay, no clothes, no provisions, no rum," chanted by the men at Valley Forge. There was never a satisfactory supply of vegetables and milk. Sickness was rampant while the army was in camp, hospital stores were almost unknown, even the sick died on the frozen ground for lack of blankets or straw. At Valley Forge, Washington reported 3000 men unfit for duty because of their nakedness.

Not only was the soldier ill-armed, but he was worse clothed, often shoeless. One found every variety of dress. Farmers in their usual clothes, and frontiersmen in buckskin with the loose hunting shirts, were the nearest to any uniformity in dress. In Greene's southern campaign many men were naked save for breech cloths. In the

north the soldiers often lacked boots in the winter, and could be traced in the snow by bloody footprints. Toward the end of the war, the army was described as "illy clad, badly fed, and worse paid." Too often the military chest was "totally exhausted" and the paymaster with not a dollar in hand. Credit was usually strained and sometimes the troops were "in a state not far from mutiny," which might have been serious but for Washington's firmness and astuteness. Some of the officers, driven by scanty pay to "low and dirty arts," were dishonest, encouraged misbehavior in their men, led plundering raids and refused to restore stolen goods. The causes for these conditions were: the lack of any military traditions, failure to insist upon long-term enlistments, the ineptitude of Congress and sectional jealousy. It is unsurpassed evidence of Washington's ability and genius that he kept the army from disintegration and destruction.

[L. C. Hatch, *The Administration of the American Revolutionary Army*; Rupert Hughes, *George Washington*.]

NELSON VANCE RUSSELL

Revolutionary Army, Foreign Volunteers in the. The ideal of human liberty actuating the colonies in 1776 found response in the hearts of many Europeans, especially in France. A small proportion of those who wrote Franklin offering their services actually reached America. The first Secret Aid ships of Beaumarchais, the *Mercure* and the *Amphitrite*, landed about thirty volunteers in March and April, 1777, at Portsmouth. A few stragglers and four Royal Engineers, the latter sent for by Congress, reached Philadelphia in June, from the West Indies, while Lafayette and his eleven officers, making their way over intolerable roads from Charleston, arrived in July. More than half of these men were rejected by Congress and had their expenses paid back to France.

Among the most notable of those commissioned were: Armand, Marquis de la Rouërie; Pierre-Charles l'Enfant, later designer of the insignia of the Cincinnati and of the National Capital; Tronson du Coudray, drowned in September in the Schuylkill; Kosciuszko, a Lithuanian, who arrived in 1776, and built the fortifications at West Point; Louis Lebegue Duportail, fortified Valley Forge; Gouvion and Villefranche, who were Duportail's assistants; and Pulaski, a Polish count, who was killed at Savannah.

Only two of Lafayette's officers were retained by Congress: DeKalb, killed at Camden⁹¹, and the latter's aide Dubuisson, wounded and made prisoner there.

The last Secret Aid volunteers to arrive came

on the *Flamand* in December, 1777, sent by Beaumarchais: among them were von Steuben, and his interpreter, Duponceau, the latter of whom remained in America and became a noted lawyer in Philadelphia.

[Thomas Balch, *The French in America*; E. S. Kite, *Duportail and the French Engineers*; Lafayette and His Companions on the *Victoir*, *Records, Amer. Catholic Hist. Soc.*, 1934, four numbers.]

ELIZABETH S. KITE

Revolutionary Committees. The American Revolution^o was fomented by committees, organized by committees, and, in great measure, conducted by committees. At the first sign of trouble with the mother country committees sprang up here, there and everywhere, to give voice to the general protest; and, by the time the break came with Great Britain, the whole country, from the colonial capital to the remotest community, was afire with committees. If anywhere they were not already in existence by the summer of 1775, they were speedily promoted. For the conflagration known as the American Revolution was not only fanned from below, to no small degree the flame was projected downward by a vigorous draft created at the top.

First in the procession of these laborers in the Revolutionary cause were the committees of correspondence^o, so called because they were chiefly engaged in gathering information and propagandizing their doctrines by means of the quill. There followed another group, generally known as the committees of safety^o (quite as often called councils of safety), whose function it was to keep the revolutionary spirit alive and assist in its formulation. In some instances these colonial committees, of whatever name, were instrumental in establishing provincial congresses^o, which constituted the revolutionary governments of the colonies for the time being, as they were also the chief agencies, either directly or through the provincial congresses, in calling together that convention of colonial committees, called the First Continental Congress^o, which met in September, 1774.

The First Continental Congress, in its turn, gave a new impetus to committees, for in that boycott of British goods which it proposed, called the Association^o, it recommended that committees be chosen in every county, city and town, "whose business it shall be attentively to observe the conduct of all persons touching this association"; that is, to enforce the Association. Such committees (usually called committees of observation and inspection, committees of inquiry and the like) were set up accordingly; and they not only observed, inspected and inquired, they took action, usually as courts both of first and

last resort. When the Second Continental Congress met in May, 1775, upon the call of the First, it soon became the head and center of the Revolution, and, with its aid and comfort, there presently began a new era both in provincial congresses and in committees. As a first essential step, in the collapse of the old colonial governments, the timid and hesitant Congress advised the colonies to appoint committees of safety to serve as *de facto* governments, "in the recess of their assemblies and conventions." Only when Congress had grown bolder did it urge the completion of the revolutionary process.

The committees that were created in this period varied widely, from colony to colony, in constitution and powers, but in general the central committee was appointed by the Provincial Congress, with designated powers to be exercised between sittings of the Provincial Congress or Convention, and with some degree of authority over the local committees. This authority did not, however, always subsist. The local committees were much disposed to act independently. In fact, it was the local committees that became, in great measure, the effective agencies of the Revolution. It was they chiefly that dealt with Tories^o, as in many other matters they promoted the cause of the Revolution in ways that to them seemed good. They have had their later models in the frontier vigilante^o committees, but, unlike the vigilantes, they chose to implement their authority by such means as tar and feathers^o, rather than with the noose. In short, reform, not execution, was their main objective. Execution was a very serious business; reform might have its accompaniment of downright fun.

Not all of the Revolutionary committees can be classed under the categories mentioned. Some colonies, for instance, had councils of war or boards of war, which might or might not act independently of the committee of safety. There were also, occasionally, various other committees designed to aid in the prosecution of the war, as, for instance, committees of supplies. Finally, there were organizations quite outside any official enclosure, such as the Sons of Liberty^o, that played no insignificant part in the Revolution.

There were some survivals after the organization of state governments, but for the most part committees, of the sort described, thereafter vanished from the picture. At the same time, however, the shifting of the Revolutionary center of gravity to the Continental Congress gave rise to the development of another type of committee that had an important part in the conduct of the Revolution and likewise in the development

of our system of government. Like every other legislative body, Congress had perforce to do much of its work through committees of its own members; and such were the importance and the permanence of the tasks devolving upon some of these committees that they came to be called "standing committees." Because of the fluctuating membership of Congress it frequently came about that the personnel of these committees became depleted, and their business fell into neglect accordingly. The first serious effort by Congress to remedy this state of affairs was in the creation of mixed boards, composed partly of members and partly of outsiders, the latter to constitute a sort of permanent staff. The next step was to erect these boards into executive departments, composed entirely of nonmembers, or with single executive heads. This last step was not taken, however, until 1781, when the war was approaching an end. Several of these executive departments, still functioning when the Constitution⁹⁹ was adopted, passed over to the new government intact, and became departments in the so-called Cabinet⁹⁹. What was first a Committee of Secret Correspondence, then a Committee for Foreign Affairs, later a Department of Foreign Affairs, became the Department of State⁹⁹. What was the Board of War developed into the Department of War⁹⁹. The business of the treasury, beginning with a committee and developing into a board, passed for a time into the hands of a single executive, the superintendent of finance, then back into the board form, thence into the Treasury Department⁹⁹ under the new government. The Navy Department⁹⁹ similarly had its origin in the Marine or Naval Committee, which became for a time a Department of Marine. The most important of the standing committees of the Continental Congress that did not become one of the early Cabinet departments was the Committee of Commerce, or Commercial Committee⁹⁹, of which the earliest progenitor was the Secret Committee (not to be confused with the Committee of Secret Correspondence).

[Richard Frothingham, *Rise of the Republic of the United States*, C. H. Van Tyne, *The War for Independence*; Jennings B. Sanders, *Evolution of Executive Departments of the Continental Congress, 1774-89*; Agnes Hunt, *The Provincial Committees of Safety of the American Revolution*.]

EDMUND C. BURNETT

Revolutionary War, Profiteering in the. One of the most difficult problems which confronted the Continental Congress⁹⁹ was the procuring of supplies of all kinds for the army. Many individuals purchased large stores of provisions and then when the currency rapidly depreciated de-

manded exorbitant prices. Naturally such persons were considered profiteers. The agents sent to confiscate the Loyalists⁹⁹ property in many cases pocketed a large share of the funds.

Congress on March 3, 1776, directed Silas Deane to go to France and purchase artillery, munitions, clothing and arms for 25,000 men. Deane was one of five merchants who were authorized to procure colonial goods, ship them abroad, sell them, and with the proceeds to buy supplies. In France, Deane was closely associated with Beaumarchais who had established the firm of *Hortalez et Cie*⁹⁹ to aid the Americans. Loans and large gifts of money and supplies were received from the French government. Deane, in the meantime, had made connections with the commercial firm of Willing and Morris in Philadelphia. Faction, intrigue and jealousy, largely engineered by Arthur Lee, caused Congress to recall Deane early in 1778. Charges of "unlimited robbery and treason" were made on the basis that the supplies were all gifts of the French government, and that Deane and Beaumarchais were "planning merely to line their own pockets." These charges were never proven, but were responsible for ruining the career of an able patriot whose only fault was in not being meticulous in separating his private commercial interests from his public business. Factions in Congress, economic interests and sectionalism were largely accountable for a great injustice. (See also France, American Joint Commission to.)

Charges of profiteering and of growing rich by "thievish speculation" were likewise brought against Robert Morris on several occasions. Morris had great business acumen and lost no opportunity, while in private or in public life, to make his profit in a deal. He bought great quantities of supplies, taking very great risks, and no doubt made large profits. In 1779 Morris was formally charged with speculation in flour, of "engrossing" it. Growing richer and richer, Morris became the object of envy and jealousy of many, especially the poor who resented his wealth. In 1779 Paine, through the press, made a bitter attack on Morris for conducting private commercial enterprises while holding public office. Henry Laurens, likewise, made charges of fraud against the firm of Willing and Morris. A congressional investigation reported no foundation for such charges and commended Morris for his "fidelity and integrity." The truth was that Morris' services were invaluable and he gave the leaders of the war financial assistance and moral support without which the army would have perished.

When the states established fixed prices for

materials, some enterprising merchants purchased supplies in one state and transported them on fast sailing ships to states where prices were higher. These men were charged with profiteering. Again the risks were great and there were few who were successful. Most of the censure, if any censure is justifiable, for these conditions can be explained by the ineptitude of the Congress.

[G. L. Clark, *Silas Deane*; E. P. Oberholtzer, *Robert Morris*.]

NELSON VANCE RUSSELL

Revolutionary War, THE, opened at Boston (*see* Boston Port Act). This city had been especially active in resistance to English colonial policies, and hence troops were sent there. On April 19, 1775, a British attempt to seize military stores brought on the double battle of Lexington and Concord⁹⁹. New England militia assembled about Boston (*see* Minutemen), and on June 16, 1775, they began to fortify a spur of Bunker Hill⁹⁹, overlooking Boston. The British broke up this attempt on June 17, but the blockade continued. The independence of the colonies was declared July 4, 1776, and the insurgent forces were reorganized under command of George Washington (*see* Washington's Eight Months Army).

Meanwhile, attempts were made to invade Canada⁹⁹. These failed, but one of the preliminary moves was the capture of Ticonderoga⁹⁹, May 10, 1775, which gave the colonists an excellent train of artillery. These guns were moved to Boston as soon as freezing weather made transportation possible; their employment rendered Boston untenable, and the British garrison was withdrawn to Halifax on March 17, 1776 (*see* Boston, Siege of).

England now assumed the offensive. The point of attack was New York, and the general idea was to gain control of the Hudson River and cut the colonies in two. Gen. Howe returned from Halifax, and his brother, Admiral Lord Howe, brought a powerful fleet. Washington had foreseen this move, and transferred his army to New York, occupying Manhattan and Brooklyn.

The British attack came first upon the Brooklyn force, which was driven out in the battle of Long Island⁹⁹, Aug. 27, 1776. Howe then pressed Washington northward out of Manhattan, and began to extend toward Philadelphia. Washington established a strong post in the Highlands of the Hudson, and with his field force retired through Jersey behind the Delaware. The British operations lacked vigor, for the Howe brothers, under orders from England, continually endeavored to open peace negotiations. Washing-

ton's defensive plan was to keep inshore from Howe, moving as he moved; to this end he established his "line of communications," a chain of supply depots just above the heads of navigation on the main rivers. He made brilliant counter-strokes at Trenton (Dec. 26, 1776) and Princeton (Jan. 3, 1777), forcing Howe back to New Brunswick; then established himself for the winter at Morristown, on Howe's inshore flank⁹⁹.

For 1777 the British plan called for opening the Hudson from both ends—Howe from New York and Burgoyne from Montreal (*see* British Campaign of 1777). A column under Col. St. Leger was to co-operate with Burgoyne⁹⁹, moving down the Mohawk Valley. But Howe, not in sympathy with this plan, took advantage of a certain vagueness in his orders from home to turn his main force toward the "rebel capital" at Philadelphia, leaving at New York a force too small for effective operations up the Hudson (*see* Highlands, The). St. Leger's column was defeated at Oriskany⁹⁹ and Fort Stanwix (Aug. 6). Burgoyne himself suffered a serious reverse on Aug. 16, when a strong detachment was beaten at Bennington⁹⁹, Vt. His main body pushed south to the region of Saratoga, and on Sept. 19 attacked the Americans at Freeman's Farm⁹⁹. A counterattack by Gen. Arnold almost succeeded, but Gen. Gates, in chief command, refused to support Arnold, and Burgoyne held his ground. He renewed the attack on Oct. 7, and this time was badly beaten and forced to surrender (Oct. 17, 1777).

Howe, meanwhile, had moved his main force south by sea, landed at the head of Chesapeake Bay on Aug. 25, and marched for Philadelphia. Washington tried to check him at the Brandywine River⁹⁹ on Sept. 11, but was outflanked and almost trapped. Howe entered Philadelphia on Sept. 26. Washington attacked at Germantown on Oct. 4, but failed, and took up position for the winter at Valley Forge⁹⁹, twenty-five miles up the Schuylkill. In spite of the great hardships suffered here, advantage was taken of the opportunity for reorganization and training, under the supervision of Gen. von Steuben; and news of the French alliance helped to keep up spirit (*see* Franco-American Alliance of 1778).

In May, 1778, Howe was relieved by Gen. Clinton, who promptly gave up Philadelphia and marched for New York. Washington struck his flank at Monmouth Court House⁹⁹ on June 28, but Clinton made good his withdrawal. Washington established himself at White Plains. Operations in the north after this were unimportant.

In the autumn of 1778 Clinton sent an expedition south, which occupied Savannah and Augusta⁹⁹. In 1779 a French fleet under Admiral d'Estaing arrived to co-operate with the Americans under Gen. Lincoln. Siege was laid to Savannah, but d'Estaing was compelled by approach of the stormy season to return to the West Indies. Lincoln fell back to Charleston⁹⁹, and was besieged by Clinton, who brought reinforcements from New York; Lincoln surrendered on May 12, 1780. Clinton then returned to New York, leaving Cornwallis in command.

Congress sent Gen. Gates to command in the south. On Aug. 16 he was utterly defeated at Camden⁹⁹; Gen. Greene succeeded him. Cornwallis advanced northward, but was weakened by the loss of two strong detachments—Maj. Ferguson's at King's Mountain, Oct. 7, 1780, and Col. Tarleton's at the Cowpens⁹⁹, Jan. 17, 1781. Greene conducted a masterly retreat to Virginia, and Cornwallis, finding his force too small and his line of communications too long for further pursuit, fell back to Wilmington, N. C. Then, leaving a small detachment in the Carolinas, he took his main body to Virginia to join British troops already there. Greene soon drove the Carolina detachment into Charleston, where it remained for the rest of the war.

In Virginia, Cornwallis effected his junction with the other British forces, and found himself opposed only by a small force under Lafayette. After some successful operations, he fortified himself at Yorktown to await Clinton's decision as to the next move.

The French alliance now made itself felt. A French land and naval force under Gen. Rochambeau had established itself at Newport in the summer of 1780, and in the spring of 1781 Admiral DeGrasse brought another French squadron into American waters. By very skilful maneuvering the entire French force, land and naval, with the bulk of Washington's army on the Hudson, was concentrated before Yorktown⁹⁹, and a siege was opened on Oct. 6. Cornwallis surrendered on Oct. 19. Military operations after this time were insignificant, although the Definitive Treaty of Peace⁹⁹ was not concluded for almost two years.

[Oliver L. Spaulding, *The United States Army in War and Peace*.]

OLIVER L. SPAULDING

Rhea Letter. On Jan. 6, 1818, Andrew Jackson wrote to President Monroe, offering to conquer the Floridas if approval was signified "through any channel (say Mr. J. Rhea)." Monroe, ill at the time, left the passage unread. Subsequently, Jackson received a letter from his friend Rhea

of Tennessee which he construed as giving Monroe's sanction to the plan. On this basis Jackson later claimed Monroe's authorization for his campaign in Florida, despite the President's denial (*see* Arbuthnot and Ambrister, Case of).

[John S. Bassett, *The Life of Andrew Jackson*, Vol. I.]

HARVEY WISH

Rhode Island was founded between 1636 and 1647. In June of the former year, Roger Williams settled at Providence⁹⁹. The second town, Portsmouth, was established in April, 1638, by former residents of Massachusetts, who had left that colony because of the Antinomian controversy⁹⁹. Newport was founded in May, 1639, as an offshoot of Portsmouth, and Warwick came into existence 1643-47 through the efforts of a religious mystic and staunch individualist, Samuel Gorton⁹⁹. At first largely independent of each other, the four original settlements entered into a united colonial government in May, 1647, under the parliamentary charter of 1644, secured by Roger Williams (*see* Rhode Island, Colonial Charters of).

Previous to 1636, the coast of Rhode Island was visited by several white explorers. Miguel Cortereal, the Portuguese navigator, was probably in the region in 1511, and in 1524 Giovanni da Verrazzano visited Narragansett Bay. His comment that an island in the vicinity, probably the present Block Island, reminded him of the Isle of Rhodes in the Mediterranean, led in a roundabout fashion to the present name of the state. The Dutch navigator, Adriaen Block, explored the coast in 1614, leaving his name attached to Block Island, some ten miles off the mainland. William Blackstone, an Anglican clergyman and a recluse, settled in 1635 in what is now Cumberland, R. I., but which was then considered a part of Massachusetts.

Founded on the principle of religious freedom, of which Roger Williams was the most pertinacious advocate, Rhode Island became a refuge for sects that encountered discrimination elsewhere in British America. After 1657 the colony acquired a large Quaker⁹⁹ element, and a small though influential Jewish⁹⁹ group. No single religious sect, however, dominated colonial affairs in the 18th century; the Baptists, Quakers and Episcopalians were all strong, with the Congregationalists⁹⁹ in a minor position. Rhode Island secured its second charter in 1663, from Charles II. This document gave official sanction "to hold forth a livelie experiment" in the separation of church and state, which Rhode Island consistently observed, save for the deprivation of suffrage to Roman Catholics⁹⁹, 1664-1783, which worked

little hardship as there were then few of that persuasion in the state.

From the mid-17th century to the Revolution, the colony engaged in nine wars. Rhode Islanders carried on privateering against the Dutch, 1652-54, and were prepared to engage in similar activity during England's later wars with Holland, 1664-67 and 1672-74, although little warfare materialized on this side of the Atlantic. King Philip's War^w wreaked considerable damage on the colony. Roger Williams was unsuccessful in keeping the Narragansetts^w out of the conflict. The winter encampment of that tribe was destroyed Dec. 19, 1675, after which scattered bands of Indians descended on Warwick and Providence. King Philip was trapped in Bristol by Capt. Benjamin Church, and killed Aug. 12, 1676. For a short time, 1685-89, Rhode Island was a part of the Dominion of New England^w.

During the four wars fought between 1689 and 1763, Rhode Islanders took part as privateersmen and soldiers on campaign in many parts of New England and New York. Privateering^w received such a stimulus from the early French wars that it tended to continue as freebooting, but this activity was suppressed before long. Twenty-six pirates were hanged near Newport in July, 1723.

Farming was the chief occupation in the colonial period, although shipbuilding and commerce became important in the 18th century. There was an extensive triangular trade^w—rum to Africa for Negroes, slaves from thence to the West Indies and molasses from the latter to Rhode Island for the manufacture of more rum^w. Iron works were first established in 1671 at Pawtucket^w, by Joseph Jencks, Jr. In South County were large landed estates, run with Negro labor, which were similar to Southern plantations (see Narragansett Planters). Rhode Island College, now Brown University^w, was chartered in 1764, but the state did not have a public school^w system until after 1800. John Smibert, Robert Feke and Gilbert Stuart were the best known early artists; fine examples of colonial architecture still survive in Providence, Newport, Bristol, Wickford and elsewhere.

Resistance to British colonial regulations, which foreshadowed the Revolution, began in June, 1765, with an attack on the *Maidstone* in Newport harbor. In 1769 the British revenue sloop *Liberty* was scuttled, and in June, 1772, the *Gaspee*^w was burned off Warwick. Rhode Island raised 1500 troops immediately following the battle of Lexington^w, and on May 4, 1776, declared her independence from Great Britain. The only important engagement fought in the

state was the battle of Rhode Island, in Portsmouth, Aug. 29, 1778 (see Rhode Island, Sullivan in); it was an inconclusive struggle, but one which prevented the British from advancing farther into the state from their base at Newport, which they held from December, 1776, to October, 1779. Rhode Island contributed many leaders to distant fields of operation, particularly Esek Hopkins, Commander in Chief of the Continental Navy, 1775-77, and Gen. Nathanael Greene, hero of the 1781 campaign in the far South (see Southern Campaigns).

The Revolution cost the state about \$1,000,000, and led to a disastrous monetary inflation which was not checked until 1786. Rhode Island was not represented at the Convention of 1787^w, and it did not ratify the new Constitution until May 29, 1790, by the close vote of 34-32. Rhode Island considered it to her interest to remain outside the Union, in the hope that she could herself use the customs revenue from her import trade. After 1790, however, commerce gradually declined, to be supplanted by manufacturing. With the establishment at Pawtucket in 1789, by Moses Brown and Samuel Slater, of the first successful cotton mill in the United States, Rhode Island entered on the road to its present position as a predominantly industrial state (see Textiles).

[S. G. Arnold, *History of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*; C. Carroll, *Rhode Island, Three Centuries of Democracy*; E. Field, *State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*; I. B. Richman, *Rhode Island, Its Making and Its Meaning*.]

JARVIS M. MORSE

Rhode Island, Colonial Charters of. (1) Roger Williams secured the first charter, March, 1644, from a parliamentary commission headed by the Earl of Warwick^w. It provided for an elected president, assistants and General Court^w, and guaranteed liberty of conscience. The first assembly, with John Coggeshall of Newport as president, met at Portsmouth, May 19-21, 1647. (2) The restoration of Charles II in 1660 made necessary a royal charter, which was secured in 1663 by John Clarke. It provided for an elected governor, deputy-governor, assistants and General Assembly. Separation of church and state was maintained; suffrage was left to colonial control.

[F. N. Thorpe, *The Federal and State Constitutions, Colonial Charters, etc.*, Vol. VI.]

JARVIS M. MORSE

Rhode Island, Sullivan in (1778). Because of expected reinforcement by a French fleet under d'Estaing, with 4000 soldiers, Sullivan planned a joint attack on the British at Newport. Militia

reinforcements were furnished. Lafayette and Nathanael Greene were also sent.

D'Estaing arrived off Newport early in August, 1778, after having delayed at New York. As he prepared to land his troops a British squadron appeared. D'Estaing decided to attack it, but a furious gale so damaged his ships as to cause him to go to Boston for repairs. Sullivan objected in indiscreet terms. Meanwhile, he had invested Newport. His militia melted away. Lacking d'Estaing's support, Sullivan decided to withdraw. The British pursued. On Aug. 29, 1778, a spirited fight took place, known as the battle of Rhode Island or Quaker Hill. All British attacks were repelled, but news of coming British reinforcements caused Sullivan to cross to Tiverton on the mainland. The British returned to Newport.

[F. V. Greene, *The Revolutionary War and the Military Policy of the United States.*] THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Rhode Island in the Dutch War of 1653. The Council of State having authorized the colony to take warlike action against the Dutch, the Rhode Island assembly, in May, issued privateer^{er} commissions to John Underhill, William Dyer and Edward Hull, and subsequently to Thomas Baxter and to the vessel *Debora*. Underhill and Dyer captured the Dutch House of Hope^{er} on the Connecticut River. Underhill raided Southold, L. I., and destroyed the fort near Islip. Hull captured a Dutch pinnace in the Connecticut River, a Dutch trading boat at Milford and a French frigate. His lieutenant, Comstock, raided Block Island. Baxter captured three small vessels and seized some horses. He caused disturbances in Stamford and Milford, was blockaded by a Dutch fleet, and arrested by Connecticut authorities. Rhode Island was the only New England colony to actively engage against the Dutch in this war.

[Howard M. Chapin, *Privateer Ships and Sailors.*]

HOWARD M. CHAPIN

Rhodes Scholarships, established by the will of Cecil John Rhodes, who died in 1902, were put into operation in October, 1904; thirty-two annual appointments were assigned to the United States and an approximately equal number to the British Dominions and to Germany. A Rhodes Scholar is appointed for two years in the first instance and the Scholarship may be, and usually is, extended for a third year. The stipend is £400 per year.

Rhodes Scholarships are awarded upon the basis of four groups of qualities specified in the Rhodes will, the first two of which are consid-

ered most important: (1) literary and scholastic ability and attainments, (2) qualities of manhood, truth, courage, devotion to duty, sympathy, kindness, unselfishness and fellowship; (3) exhibition of moral force of character and of instincts to lead and to take an interest in his schoolmates; and (4) physical vigor, as shown by interest in outdoor sports or in other ways.

There are now nearly 1000 returned Rhodes Scholars living in the United States. One third of these hold academic positions, including fourteen college or university presidents, and an equal number in other administrative posts. About one fifth of the group are lawyers and the remainder are engaged in various occupations, principally business, government service, journalism and medicine.

[Aydelotte, Crosby and Valentine, *Oxford of Today; Oxford University Handbook*, Sir George Parkins, *The Rhodes Scholarships.*]

FRANK AYDELOTTE

Rhyolite was the chief town of the Bullfrog Mining District during the active period, 1904-14. Permanent stone and concrete buildings were erected at this site on the railroad connecting Las Vegas and Goldfield. Water and electric light systems, churches, schools and newspapers served several thousands of citizens. Mining decline was followed by abandonment of the railroad in 1914, leaving Rhyolite a real "ghost city"^{er}.

[Francis C. Lincoln, *Mining Districts and Mineral Resources of Nevada.*]

JEANNE ELIZABETH WIER

Ribbon Farms. This name was given by the American settlers at Detroit^{er} and elsewhere to the narrow river front farms of French feudal origin. A typical farm might be one or more arpents (an arpent = 192.24 English feet) wide and either 40 or 80 arpents (1½ to 3 miles) deep.

M. M. QUAIFE

Rice, Fort (Dakota Territory), was established July 11, 1864, and the military reservation at this point was authorized by President Lincoln Sept. 2, 1864. It was situated on the right bank of the Missouri River, ten miles north of the mouth of the Cannonball River and twenty-eight miles south of the later site of Fort Abraham Lincoln^{er}. The fort was named for Henry M. Rice, first territorial delegate to Congress and later first U. S. senator from Minnesota.

The fort was first occupied by Gen. Alfred Sully as a base of supplies in his operations against the Dakota Indians west of the Missouri River (*see* Dakotas, Expeditions of Gen. Sibley and Gen. Sully in). When he started on his campaign to the northwest, he left Col. Daniel H.

Dill of the 30th Regiment of the Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, with five companies, to construct the buildings at the fort.

In 1871 a force consisting of 1000 soldiers, scouts and surveyors was sent from Fort Rice, under Gen. Whistler, to act as guard for the Northern Pacific Railway Companysm survey party west of the Missouri River.

The fort was abandoned Nov. 25, 1878, and the garrison was transferred to Fort Lincoln. The military reservation was vacated by order of President Arthur, July 22, 1884. O. G. LIBBY

Rice-Campbell Debates, THE (1843), between Nathan Lewis Rice, an Old-School Presbyterian, and Alexander Campbell, founder of the Disciples of Christsm, took place in Lexington, Ky., Nov. 15 to Dec. 2, 1843, before large crowds, Henry Clay lending prestige by his presence as moderator. The propositions debated were: the nature, purpose and regulation of baptism, and its relation to church creeds. The debates fixed public attention on the Disciples as a denomination, consolidated their doctrines of primitive Christianity around the ordinance of baptism, clarified the differences between them and the Presbyterians and Baptistssm and emphasized the Disciples' plea for Christian union.

[A. Campbell and N. L. Rice, *Debate on Christian Baptism*; W. E. Garrison, *Religion Follows the Frontier*; J. J. Haley, *Debates That Made History*.]

HAROLD E. DAVIS

Rice Culture and Trade. After an unsuccessful attempt in 1647 to grow rice in Virginia, it was discovered that the warm, moist lowlands of South Carolina were especially favorable to the propagation of the grain. It is asserted that initial impetus was given to its cultivation by the gift of seed rice brought from Madagascar to Charleston by a storm-driven ship in about 1694. Whether this story is true or not, intensive cultivation of the grain came soon after that date, and its growing and export offered the best opportunity for industrial profit which 18th-century America afforded. After a temporary setback caused by the American Revolution, the industry was revived, and by the time of the Civil War it was the basis of a wealthy aristocracy of a few hundred planters living within the narrow range of the tidal flow near or in Georgetown, Charleston and Beaufort in South Carolina and in the adjoining areas of North Carolina and Georgia.

During the colonial period inundations necessary for the most effective cultivation of the grain were achieved by the impounding of rain and brooks above inland swamps. But the scarcity

Rice's Winnebago Contract

of water of this origin led after 1783 to the adoption of the system of tidal-flowing. Lands lying within range of the fresh-water tides were equipped with banks, ditches and sluices used for the flooding and draining of these areas thrice each year. They were cultivated by gangs of Negro slaves. At the same time that the tide-flowing system was adopted, drills and harrows were substituted for hand labor, and water-driven threshing mills replaced sticks and wind-fans. About 1820 steam was adopted as the motive power of these mills and they were moved from the plantations to the towns. Before the Civil War the plantations were large semi-capitalistic enterprises, but that event gave the industry a staggering blow from which there was partial recovery for two decades and then gradual annihilation. The free black labor failed to function efficiently in the unhealthy swamps; the improved machinery bogged in the soft soil; crop after crop was ruined by freshets and coastal storms; and the competition of the southwestern planters brought ruinous prices. By the beginning of the 20th century the Carolina rice fields had returned to their original marshes.

Rice culture began in Louisiana as early as 1718, but for a long time it was unimportant and confined to the lower delta of the Mississippi. After the Civil War landowners of that state eagerly turned to it as an escape from recent impoverishment. Their lands were suitable for the new agricultural machinery, and the grain gave immediate and uniform returns. By 1877 they were able to claim that their product equaled Carolina's best, that their plantation life was healthier, and that they were producing 30% of the nation's total rice. After 1884 prairie regions in Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas were found to be suited for rice; the lands were level; the rivers and bayous were suitable for irrigation; and there were no cataclysmic storms or destroying floods. At present the great bulk of the national crop is produced in those areas.

[D. C. Heyward, *Seed from Madagascar*.]

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS

Rice's Winnebago Contract. April 13, 1850, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs secretly contracted with Henry M. Rice of St. Paul, Minn., to remove the Wisconsin and Iowa Winnebago to the Long Prairie (Minn.) reservation for seventy dollars apiece. Rice moved about 600 Indians, and eventually, in 1861, after congressional investigation, his assignees collected \$24,327.46.

[William W. Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*; Removal of the Winnebagoes, in 31 Congress, 1 Session, *House Reports* 501.]

WILLOUGHBY M. BABCOCK

"Rich, and Good and Wise." See "Wise, and Good and Rich," The.

Rich Mountain, Battle of (July 11, 1861). Planning to seize western Virginia for the Confederacy, Gen. R. S. Garnett fortified the roads to Wheeling and Parkersburg, at Laurel Mountain and Rich Mountain. Gen. McClellan (U.), advancing from Grafton, held the Confederates while Gen. Rosecrans (U) led a column around the left of those on Rich Mountain and cut off their retreat. Col. Pegram (C), commanding there, surrendered. Garnett, retreating hastily from Laurel Mountain, was killed during the retirement.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. I; *Official Records, Union and Confederate Armies*, Vol. II.]

JOSEPH MILLS HANSON

Richelieu River, THE, which rises in Bennington County, Vt., expands into Lake Champlain, and empties into the St. Lawrence after a course of 210 miles, was discovered by Samuel Champlain in 1609. It was first known to the French as the Rivière des Iroquois, as it was the route between the Iroquois country and Quebec. Afterward it was the recognized thoroughfare, in peace and war, between New England and New France⁹⁹. The French general Montcalm sent DeLévis up the Richelieu in 1756 to defend the frontier; and the following year took the same route to capture Fort William Henry⁹⁹; and in 1758 to win the battle of Ticonderoga⁹⁹. Montgomery, in 1775, led an expedition against Canada (see Canada, American Invasion of) and captured the forts at St. Johns and Chambly⁹⁹ on the Richelieu. In more recent and peaceful times, the Richelieu has borne a moderate volume of commerce between the United States and Canada, and in 1937 was investigated as part of a proposed deep waterway from the Hudson to the St. Lawrence.

[George M. Wrong, *Canada and the American Revolution*.]

LAWRENCE J. BURPEE

Richmond (Ky.), Battle of. In the late summer of 1862, Kirby Smith (C.) with some 16,000 troops invaded Kentucky in the direction of Lexington. His first skirmish with the Federals occurred on Aug. 29 near Rogersville, south of Richmond in Madison County. Here the Confederates were repulsed, but the next day Smith drove the raw Union force of about 7000 men, under Generals Nelson and Manson, along the highway, over the meadows and corn fields, and even into the cemetery and through the streets of Richmond. The Federals made two or three desperate attempts to stop the enemy, but were

defeated, with losses of 1050 killed and wounded, 4303 prisoners, and a great quantity of supplies.

[*Confederate Military History*, Vol. VIII; *War of the Rebellion: Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, Ser I, Vol. 16, Pt. I; J. T. Dorris, *Old Cane Springs: A Story of the War between the States in Madison County, Kentucky*.]

JONATHAN T. DORRIS

Richmond, Campaign against (1864-65). Strictly speaking the campaigns against Richmond began under McDowell in July, 1861 (see Bull Run, First Battle of) and continued throughout the war, but the final campaign is usually assigned this terminology. It began early in May, 1864, when Grant crossed the Rapidan River and entered the Wilderness in command of an army of 122,000 men. His military objectives were to destroy Lee's army and capture Richmond. With a much smaller force Lee contested Grant's purpose for eleven months. A terrific but fruitless two-day struggle in the battle of the Wilderness was followed by a flanking march to Spotsylvania Courthouse⁹⁹, where another bloody and indecisive conflict took place. Another move to his left by Grant brought the two armies together on the North Anna River; but Grant declined battle and, by a flanking march, reached Cold Harbor⁹⁹, where, in sight of Richmond, his troops were devastated in direct attack on Confederate intrenchments. Stalled north of the James River, Grant, by another flanking move late in June, crossed the river and sought to force the Confederates out of Richmond by cutting its railway connections with the lower Confederacy. Failures before Petersburg in June and in the battle of the Crater, July 30, reduced operations to a long-drawn-out siege of Petersburg⁹⁹. By the following spring the strength of the Confederacy was sapped, and the forces defending Petersburg and Richmond were no longer adequate. It was necessary for Lee's army to evacuate Petersburg and abandon further defense of Richmond (see Richmond, The Burning and Evacuation of). In attempted withdrawal to southwestern Virginia, Lee's troops were surrounded at Appomattox⁹⁹ and compelled to surrender.

This final campaign against Richmond was a feature of a more extensive strategy involving both Butler's expedition up the James River and Sherman's marches in Georgia and the Carolinas⁹⁹.

[D. S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee*.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Richmond, The Burning and Evacuation of, was the dramatic and tragic end of the Confederate capital, in the first days of April, 1865. On

Sunday the second, the Union forces captured the outer works around Petersburg⁷⁰. On notice from Lee, Davis and his officials left Richmond (see Confederate Cabinet, Flight of). Mobs temporarily took control, looting shops and warehouses. By military order of the Confederates, bridges and warehouses, along with shipping, were fired. Once started, the fire, driven by high wind, spread to the business district. On their arrival, Union troops were used to extinguish the fire and restore law and order. The burning and evacuation of Richmond signaled the overthrow of the Confederacy (see Appomattox).

[B. J. Lossing, *Pictorial History of the Civil War*, Vol. III.]

ALFRED P. JAMES

Richmond, Va. In 1609 Capt. John Smith bought from the Indians some land near the site of Richmond and founded a settlement which he called None Such. Col. William Byrd by grants in 1675 and 1687 obtained a large tract of land around the site, and in 1733 his son, Col. William Byrd, founded Richmond at the falls of the James, fancying a likeness in its situation to that of Richmond on the Thames near London. The town was surveyed in 1737 and incorporated in 1742. On March 20, 1775, the second Virginia Convention met in St. John's Church (built 1741) and voted to arm against England; it was then that Patrick Henry uttered his famous "Give me liberty or give me death"⁷¹. With the decline of Williamsburg⁷², Richmond became the capital of the state in 1779. In January, 1781, a British force under Arnold (see Arnold's Raid in Virginia) destroyed warehouses and public buildings here. In 1788 Virginia ratified the Federal Constitution in convention at St. John's Church, and the Virginia Resolutions of 1798 were passed here. On Dec. 26, 1811, Gov. George W. Smith and seventy-one others lost their lives in the burning of the Richmond Theater. The city became the capital of the Confederacy in May, 1861, and throughout the Civil War⁷³ was the chief objective of the Army of the Potomac (see Richmond, Campaign against; Richmond, The Burning and Evacuation of). The city was slowly rebuilt; and, with its old Capitol and Confederate "White House," became a sort of Southern shrine, as well as a literary center. As late as 1883 it was noted for its duels among editors, or between editors and politicians.

[W. Asbury Christian, *Richmond: Her Past and Present*; John P. Little *History of Richmond*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Richmond Junto, THE, was a group, strongly states' rights⁷⁴ in tone, headed by Thomas Ritchie, editor and publisher of the *Richmond*

Enquirer (1804-45), which controlled Virginia Democratic politics for more than a quarter-century, and exercised much influence on the party's national policies. It was first called the Junto about 1820. It played a large part in defeating Van Buren for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1844.

[C. H. Ambler, *Thomas Ritchie: A Study in Virginia Politics*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Rickert Rice Mills, Inc., v. Fontenot. On Jan. 13, 1936, the Supreme Court, in this case, invalidated a statute amendatory to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933⁷⁵. The measure, approved Aug. 24, 1935, had attempted to clarify the provisions of the original enactment. Relative to this amendment, Mr. Justice Roberts ruled without dissent that it "remains a means for effectuating the regulation of agricultural production, a matter not within the powers of Congress." Funds impounded during the proceedings were returned to the Rickert Rice Mills Company and companion complainants. However, the Court refused to discuss the procedure of recovering money previously paid under the unconstitutional processing tax provisions.

[Rickert Rice Mills, Inc. v. Fontenot, 297 U. S. 110; 49 U. S. Stats. at Large, 750.]

BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH

Riders, Legislative, are sections or clauses not germane to the subject matter of a bill which are added by amendment before passage. This is done with the expectation that the sentiment favorable to the bill will be sufficient to sweep the whole enactment through the final vote and secure executive approval when the proposal would probably be defeated by vote or vetoed if submitted separately. Where the executive has power to veto sections of acts this device may not be used to escape his disapproval (see Item Veto). In many states constitutional provisions restrict each bill to a single subject, which must be clearly expressed in its title. In such cases riders would invalidate the whole law.

Riders are most commonly used in the National Government and in connection with appropriation acts. In 1913 Congress attached to an appropriation act a rider exempting labor unions from the Sherman Antitrust Act⁷⁶. President Taft had to veto the whole bill to annul this provision. Similarly, a rider establishing daylight saving time⁷⁷ was attached to an appropriation bill in 1919. President Wilson vetoed the bill, and the rider was then made a separate act which he vetoed, Congress repassing it over his veto.

[Robert Luce, *Legislative Procedure*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Ridgefield, The Battle of. On April 25, 1777, a detachment of British troops, under the command of the last colonial governor of New York, William Tryon, disembarked at Compo Point (present Westport, Conn.) and, scattering a small group of patriots who tried to stop them, marched rapidly inland to Danbury⁹⁰, Conn., where, the following day, they burned the American supplies stored there. Retreating by way of Ridgefield, they were followed by Gen. Wooster with 200 men and attacked twice. On the second attack, just outside of Ridgefield, Wooster was mortally wounded. At Ridgefield the retreating British found the way blocked by Generals Silliman and Arnold with 500 Connecticut militia. The Americans had hastily built a barricade across the village street. After a frontal attack, which failed, Tryon ordered an attack on the left flank. Arnold was unhorsed, the barricade forced, and the British, hurrying forward, reached their boats with difficulty the following day.

[G. L. Rockwell, *The History of Ridgefield.*]

A. C. FLICK

Ridgely, Fort. The sale of their Minnesota lands by the Sioux, under the Treaty of Traverse des Sioux⁹¹, July 23, 1851, and the concentration of these Indians on small upper Minnesota River reservations brought about the establishment of Fort Ridgely, April 29, 1853, on the north bank of that river in Nicollet County, Minn. On Aug. 20 and 22, 1862, it was successfully defended against powerful Sioux attacks (*see* Sioux Uprising in Minnesota). After serving as a base for Sibley's expedition⁹² in 1863, the post became obsolete and was abandoned on May 22, 1867.

[W. W. Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*; Willoughby M. Babcock, ed., *Up the Minnesota Valley to Fort Ridgely* in 1853, in *Minnesota History*, Vol. XI.]

WILLOUGHBY M. BABCOCK

Rifle, THE, has played a brilliant part in American history and it is probable that greater technical contributions to its development have been made in the United States and in the colonies from which this nation was formed than anywhere else. Originally invented in Vienna about 1500, the rifle, a firearm depending for accuracy and velocity on spiral grooves in the barrel which impart to the projectile a rotary motion about an axis parallel with the line of flight, was brought to America by Swiss and German immigrants early in the 18th century. In Lancaster, Pa., then a frontier settlement, the rifle was developed primarily as a hunting arm. As the hunters traveled long distances in search of game, light balls or bullets and a piece accurate enough

to avoid waste were essential. Continuous and eager competition among the gunsmiths—the Lemans, Terrees, Strugels, Allbrights, Lefevres, Henrys and Rossers—evolved, before the time of the Revolution, a long-barreled, small-bored piece with a muzzle velocity of some 1500 feet per second and said to be as accurate as modern rifles up to 100 yards.

By 1775 these rifles were in the hands of frontiersmen from the Carolinas to Vermont; they were unknown, however, on the coast and the early battles such as Lexington and Bunker Hill⁹³ were fought with smooth-bore muskets, ineffective except at close range. Washington, being familiar with the frontier, made great efforts to assemble riflemen from Virginia and Pennsylvania and by midsummer 1775, he had gathered 1400 of them at Cambridge where they amazed the inhabitants by hitting targets seven inches in diameter at two hundred and fifty paces. Stories of this performance, carried by spies to the British army, spread terror among the regulars and this fear of the American riflemen, which grew as the war progressed, is said to have been an important factor in the winning of the Revolution.

The great difficulty with these rifles was in their loading, done from the muzzle with a greased patch and hickory ramrod. Though the Ferguson breech loader was invented in 1776 in England, it seems to have had little use during the war. In 1831 a breech-loading carbine was patented by John Hall. From 1835 breech-loading revolver-pistols and revolver-rifles were invented by Samuel Colt⁹⁴ and were used effectively against the Seminole Indians in Florida (1838-42) and later by Texas Rangers and by the army in the Mexican War. By the time of the Civil War nineteen different breech-loading "systems" including the Sharps⁹⁵ (1848), the Maynard⁹⁶ (from 1851), the Burnside (1856), the Starr (1858) and others were in use. The army was slow in its adoption of the breech-loading rifle and it was used, in the Civil War, largely by mounted troops. The Springfield breechloader came in 1865. In the same year the magazine arrived with the Winchester rifle. In the Spanish-American War the army was equipped with the Krag-Jorgensen magazine rifle and with the old single-shot Springfield (1884). In 1904 the new clip-loading short Springfield was officially adopted.

[R. Burlingame, *March of the Iron Men*; Townsend Whelen, *The American Rifle*; C. W. Sawyer, *Firearms in American History*; J. G. W. Dillin, *The Kentucky Rifle.*]

ROGER BURLINGAME

Right of Search. *See* Visit and Search.

Right of Way Law of 1852, THE, gave to all railroad, plank road and turnpike companies chartered by the public-land states^o before 1862 a right of way of 100 feet through the public lands, with station sites and the right to take timber and stone from adjoining lands for construction purposes. In 1855 the act was amended to make it apply to the territories.

[L. H. Haney, *Congressional History of Railways in the United States, 1850-1887.*]

PAUL WALLACE GATES

Rights of Englishmen, THE, came to America with the first royal charters (see Raleigh's Patent), but, throughout the greater part of the 17th century, local regulations, particularly in New England, prevailed. The struggle against the arbitrary government of Andros (see New England, Dominion of) did more than anything else to introduce a knowledge of these "rights," which came to be identified with the common law^o, into New England. A genuine admiration for the system sprang up when it was realized that its principles contained safeguards against governmental tyranny both at home and abroad. "Let an Englishman go where he will," said the Board of Trade in 1720, "he carries as much of law and liberty with him, as the nature of things will bear." Henry Care's *English Liberties, or the Free-born Subject's Inheritance*, was reprinted at Boston (1721), and British liberties came to be defined in terms of laws which stood above both king and Parliament, and of which the colonists could not therefore be deprived. Applied to the relations between the home government and the colonies after 1761, the colonists claimed the right of Englishmen to be taxed only in case they were represented (see Taxation without Representation). Since the colonists were not represented in Parliament, it followed, so they held, that they were not liable to internal taxation by that body. In its final and boldest form the doctrine appeared in 1774 to the effect that the colonists "are entitled to life, liberty and property, and they have never ceded to any sovereign power whatever a right to dispose of either without their consent."

[C. E. Merriam, *History of American Political Theories.*]

WILLIAM S. CARPENTER

Rights of Man was a defense of the French Revolution written by Thomas Paine in reply to Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution*. The work, which was dedicated to George Washington, appeared in two parts, the first in 1791 and the second in 1792. Its circulation was very great, both in the United States and abroad, the number of copies sold in Eng-

land alone being estimated at a million and a half. To Paine the rights of man were indefeasible. "A man, by natural right, has a right to judge his own cause," he contends, "and so far as the right of the mind is concerned, he never surrenders it. But what availeth it him to judge if he has not the power to redress? He therefore deposits his right in the common stock of society, and takes the arm of society, of which he is a part, in preference and in addition to his own. Society grants him nothing. Every man is a proprietor in society, and draws on the capital as a matter of right." Only when it could be said in any country in the world that its people were happy, then might that country boast of its constitution and government. (See also Natural Rights.)

[Mary Agnes Best, *Thomas Paine.*]

J. HARLEY NICHOLS

Rights of the British Colonies [Asserted and Proved] was a tract written by James Otis in 1764, which denied the authority of Parliament to tax the colonies, drawing analogy between the colonies and Ireland, and at the same time favored Parliamentary representation for the colonies. By way of appendix, Otis declared that acts of Parliament against natural equity or the British Constitution^o were void.

[C. F. Mullett, *Some Political Writings of James Otis*, in Univ. of Missouri, *Studies*, IV, No. 3.]

RICHARD B. MORRIS

Riley, Fort (Kans.), named for Maj. Gen. Benet Riley, is located on the north bank of the Kansas River, just east of the mouth of the Republican. In 1852 Col. Thomas T. Fauntleroy, commanding officer at Fort Leavenworth^o, recommended its erection as a station and supply depot for frontier troops. Next year Congress appropriated \$65,000 for its construction, and Maj. Edmund A. Ogden was placed in charge of the work, which began immediately. It soon became important in frontier defense. Cholera^o attacked it in 1855, killing Ogden and many of his men. Its troops aided in restoring order during the exciting days of "Bleeding Kansas,"^o and helped to protect emigrants and the overland mail^o during the Civil War. On Jan. 29, 1887, Congress authorized the establishment of a school of instruction for cavalry and light artillery, which was located at Fort Riley on March 14, 1892. The post is now an important troop station and instruction center.

[E. Hunt, *History of Fort Leavenworth.*]

IDA PARKER BIEBER

Ringgold, Battle of (Nov. 27, 1863). After Bragg's (C.) defeat on Missionary Ridge^o, the Confederate Army of Tennessee^o retreated south-

ward into northern Georgia. Grant (U.) sent Hooker in pursuit (*see* Chattanooga Campaign). Cleburne, in command of Bragg's rear-guard, halted at Ringgold gap to insure the safe withdrawal of the army and trains. Hooker attacked repeatedly, but each time was repulsed. After dark, Cleburne withdrew. The pursuit ended.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War.*]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Ringgold-Rodgers Exploring Expedition, THE, sailing from Norfolk in 1853, comprised the naval vessels *Vincennes*, *John Hancock*, *Porpoise*, *John P. Kennedy* and *Fenimore Cooper*, under Commander Cadwalader Ringgold until August, 1854, and then Commander John Rodgers. In the interests of our whaling⁹⁹ industry it surveyed in the western Pacific Ocean from Tasmania northward to Herald Island in the Arctic Ocean (August, 1855). It also surveyed among the Hawaiian and Society islands, some vessels continuing work until 1859.

[Soley, Rear-Admiral John Rodgers, in *Naval Institute Proceedings*, 1882.]

DUDLEY W. KNOX

Rings, Political. A political ring is a comparatively small group of persons, usually headed by a political boss, organized to control a city, county or state, and primarily interested in deriving therefrom large personal monetary profit. Political rings have been found here and there throughout the country periodically as far back as colonial days, but they occupy a particularly colorful position in American history of the second half of the 19th century.

William Marcy Tweed did more to bring political rings into the limelight than any other person. As a young man in the New York board of aldermen he joined a ring, known as the "Forty Thieves," whose purpose it was to gain personal profit from the improper granting of franchises⁹⁹. As a member of the board of supervisors, Tweed belonged to several short-lived rings which stole rather moderately from the public. The famous political ring which bears his name (*see* Tweed Ring, The), and which for boldness has probably never been surpassed, was organized in 1869 and composed of Tweed, Mayor "O. K." Hall, Comptroller "Slippery Dick" Connolly and "Brains" Peter B. Sweeny.

Although less notorious than the Tweed Ring, the Philadelphia Gas Ring⁹⁹ actually exerted greater political influence, but indulged in less speculation. Whereas the Tweed Ring came to grief within three years of its founding, the Gas Ring wielded great political power from 1865 until 1887.

Less well known than either the Tweed or Gas Rings were the Butler Ring, the Ames Ring and the Ruef Ring. "Colonel" Edward Butler built a political ring in St. Louis in the 1890's with himself as master mind and a select group of members of the two houses of the city council as members. This ring disposed of valuable franchises to the highest bribers. About 1900 "The Genial Doctor," A. A. Ames, constructed a ring around the Minneapolis Police Department which preyed upon thieves, gamblers and other crooks. The "Curly Boss" Abraham Ruef used members of the San Francisco board of supervisors as associates, and "sold" numerous official favors to public utilities⁹⁹ during the first decade of the 20th century.

The designation "political ring" is not used currently to the extent that it has been in the past, largely because the phrase "political machine"⁹⁹ has been expanded to include what at an earlier period was meant by political ring. At an earlier time the top men in such machines as those recently operating in Chicago and Kansas City would have been designated a political ring.

[D. T. Lynch, *Boss Tweed*; Lincoln Steffens, *Autobiography*; M. R. Werner, *Tammany Hall*; Harold Zink, *City Bosses in the United States.*]

HAROLD ZINK

Rio Grande, Sibley's Operations on (1861-62). In June, 1861, Maj. H. H. Sibley resigned his commission with the United States Army, and received permission from the Confederacy to raise a force to drive the Federals from New Mexico. A regiment, mostly Texans, was raised at San Antonio and marched to Fort Bliss, near El Paso, which had recently fallen into the hands of the South. From here he moved up the Rio Grande toward Fort Craig, where Col. Canby, in command of the department of New Mexico, made his headquarters. A severe fight occurred Feb. 21, 1862, known as the battle of Valverde⁹⁹, in which Canby was driven across the river into the fort. Sibley continued on up the river and took Albuquerque without a fight, but all the stores had been destroyed by the Federals upon their evacuation. Desperate for provisions for man and horse, Sibley continued on toward Santa Fé. He was met, March 28, by Col. Slough, from Fort Union⁹⁹, and at Glorieta⁹⁹, in a terrific hand-to-hand battle, Sibley was stopped and began his retreat back down the Rio Grande. Finding himself caught between the armies of Col. Canby on the south and Col. Slough on the north, he made a 100-mile circuit around Fort Craig through the pathless mountains. Forced to abandon his wagons he was soon without food,

water and supplies and much suffering occurred. On July 6, 1862, the unfortunate army crossed back into Texas. They had lost over 500 men, killed, dead from disease, or prisoners, and the Federals still held New Mexico.

[Noel, *The Old Sibley Brigade*.]

J. G. SMITH

Rio Grande, THE, first became a significant term in American history as a direct result of the Louisiana Purchase^o. Many American expansionists felt they had bought southward and westward to that great river. Acceptance of the Sabine boundary, with the purchase of Florida, 1819 (*see* Adams-Onís Treaty), was most unpopular on the southern frontier. The filibustering expedition of Dr. James Long^o was in direct protest against the Florida treaty.

Mexican independence and liberal land grants by Mexico to American *empresarios*^o, such as Moses and Stephen F. Austin, temporarily assuaged the westerners. When friction again developed, it broke into the flames of Texan revolt, secession from Mexico and independence. The Texas Republic^o always maintained and never surrendered the principle that the Rio Grande, from its westernmost head springs to the Gulf, constituted its southern and western boundaries. The United States inherited these claims with the annexation of Texas^o. Mexico's unwillingness to accept the Rio Grande as a boundary was an immediate cause of the Mexican War^o.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo^o, 1848, utilized the river as an international boundary from its mouth to El Paso. Since that date no serious boundary question has arisen along the Rio Grande. Most naturally it has been the scene of some lawlessness, jurisdictional disputes and diplomatic incidents, particularly during irresponsible, revolutionary eras in Mexico. On the whole, the river has been a rather satisfactory boundary, and even less productive of untoward episodes than the survey boundary westward from El Paso. A river boundary at Columbus, N. Mex., for example, might well have precluded Villa's raid and the resulting Punitive Expedition^o under Pershing, which brought the two nations closer to war than has any border episode since 1848.

[George L. Rivers, *The United States and Mexico*, 1821-1848.]

JIM DAN HILL

Rio Grande, The English Colony on (1834-36). From 1832 to 1834 Dr. John Charles Beales (an Englishman), in league with other *empresarios*^o, secured colonization grants from the Mexican state of Coahuila-Texas^o embracing much

of present western Texas and eastern New Mexico. By transfer, most of the other *empresarios* left their interests to Beales. Not having money to promote the venture, he organized in New York a joint stock company, composed of such well-known men as Silas M. Stowell, Charles Edwards, Samuel Swartwout and James Watson Webb. The colony was recruited largely in England, Ireland and the continent.

On Nov. 11, 1833, a ship, the *Amos Wright*, brought the immigrants and supplies from New York to the Gulf of Mexico. They landed at Copano Bay and traveled to Beales' Rio Grande Grant via La Bahia and San Antonio. The site selected was on Las Moras Creek, about six miles above its confluence with the Rio Grande. Here, on March 16, 1834, a small town was built and named Dolores in honor of Beales' wife. Beales made two other attempts to bring additional immigrants but the colony was doomed to failure, for it was in a semiarid land, quite remote from any well settled area. Therefore, when Santa Anna crossed the Rio Grande in the spring of 1836 to suppress the Texas revolution^o, the colonists abandoned their homes and started in ox-drawn wagons for Matamoras. But while they were camping beside a lake on the San Patricio trail, all but two women and three children were massacred by a war party of Comanche Indians^o. The two women were ransomed several months later by the *Comancheros* (New Mexican traders); and the children died in captivity.

[William Kennedy, *Texas: The Rise, Progress and Prospects of the Republic of Texas*.]

C. C. RISTER

Riots. See Strikes; Mobs and Riots.

Rip Raps Contract-Scandal. In 1818, under Secretary of War John C. Calhoun, a contract was made with Elijah Mix for 150,000 perches of stone to strengthen the fortification on the Rip Raps, a small island at Old Point Comfort on the Virginia coast. Calhoun's enemies associated his name and that of his chief clerk, Maj. Christopher Van Deventer, a brother-in-law of Mix, with scandals growing out of this contract, and forced its cancellation in 1822. In 1827 a committee of the House of Representatives, after a prolonged investigation, exonerated Calhoun, but ordered Van Deventer dismissed from his position in the War Department.

[*Niles' Weekly Register*, Vols. XXII and XXXI; *American State Papers, Military Affairs*, Vol. II.]

A. C. FLICK

Rip Van Winkle. The story of the ne'er-do-well, Rip Van Winkle, who wandered off, with his dog and gun, into the Catskill Mountains,

slept for twenty years, and returned only to find what his creator, Washington Irving, calls "the dilapidations of time"—this story has a complex and ancient lineage. Perhaps Irving, when he offered this tale in *The Sketch Book* (1819), had heard its equivalent from one of the Dutch families in New York or in the regions of the Hudson. Yet it is equally certain that he was dependent upon a German version of the tale. In essence the story belongs to the lore of many peoples, for versions of it are to be found in writers so various as Herodotus, Thomas the Rhymer and historians of the Moors. Yet the legend of the magic slumber, the dwarfs and their bowling, and the return from the hills along the blue Hudson has for more than a century continued to delight the imaginations of Americans. Irving had made articulate a myth that seemed to be our very own, and had made the Catskills blossom with an unforgettable legend. Moreover, as the years passed, the meaning of the old tale seemed to deepen into a symbolic representation of the inevitable changes in American life, and of the passage of time itself, a tragedy for human beings which the whimsical, wistful story of Rip but thinly veils.

[Stanley T. Williams, *The Life of Washington Irving*, Vol. I.]

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

Ripley, Fort, a one-company army post, first called Fort Gaines, was established, April 13, 1849, on the west bank of the Mississippi near the Crow Wing (Minn.) to control the Winnebago Long Prairie Reservation. Chippewa^m unrest in August, 1862, brought an increased garrison. The fort was abandoned about 1877.

[George C. Tanner, *History of Fort Ripley, 1849 to 1859*, in *Minnesota Historical Collections*, Vol. X; Louis B. Kinder, *The Story of Old Fort Ripley*, in *Minnesota History*, Vol. IX.]

WILLOUGHBY M. BABCOCK

Ripper Legislation is the name given to acts of state legislatures, motivated by partisan considerations, whereby local (usually city) officials of one party are turned out of office and replaced with political opponents. The New Hampshire legislature, in 1921, transferred the administration of streets, highways and sewers from the city authorities in Manchester to commissions appointed by the governor; and at the same time gave to a state commission the right to veto the whole or a part of any appropriation voted by the city government. The New Jersey legislature, in 1927, passed over the governor's veto bills designed to strip the Democratic majority in the common council of Union City of its control over appointments made by the Republican

mayor, and empowering the mayor to remove all officials in office at the time of his election. Pennsylvania's Democratic legislature in 1937 sought to weaken Republican influence in local government by passing, among others, bills abolishing the Philadelphia civil service commission and municipal court, creating a new receiver of taxes in Philadelphia, and reducing the power of county commissioners in third-class counties. These measures were later held unconstitutional by the state supreme court.

[*New Hampshire Laws*, 1921, Chaps. 202-226, 273; *Laws of New Jersey*, 1927, Chap. 17; *N. Y. Times*, March 1, 1927, April 4, 12, and July 8, 1937; S. Frazer, *The New Jersey Ripper Bills—A Review of the Decision of the Court of Errors and Appeals in McCarthy v. Walter*, in *Nat. Mun. Rev.*, XXI.]

P. ORMAN RAY

River and Harbor Improvements. Prior to 1824 there was little Federal participation in river and harbor improvements, measured by current standards. The needs were relatively small, and extensive appropriations could not be economically justified. Since 1824 the War Department, through its Army Engineers, has been in direct charge of the Federal River and Harbor program. This work is prosecuted by the Engineer Department which (January, 1939) is composed of about 230 officers of the Corps of Engineers^m; 2600 civilian engineers; some 9000 inspectors, surveyors and technical men of other classifications. About 64,000 laborers are directly employed, the bulk of the work being done by contract. The Engineer Department is a decentralized organization supervised by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army. Under him are eleven Division Engineers in charge of territorial divisions which are in turn divided into forty-five districts, each in charge of a District Engineer.

The principal classes of work for the improvement of navigation are: seacoast harbors, Great Lakes harbors and channels, the Mississippi River system, the intracoastal system and other waterways and rivers. The Panama Canal^m is also an outstanding improvement. In connection with many navigation developments, flood control^m has necessarily gone hand in hand. Recently (1936) the Federal Government established a definite flood-control policy which provides for participation in economically justified flood-control projects throughout the United States.

The plan for developing our seacoast harbors provides harbors sufficient in number, of such characteristics and so distributed as to meet the needs of our foreign and coastwise commerce. The present excellence of our harbors

has resulted in cheaper ocean rates, thus increasing the profits on all exports sold in foreign markets.

The plan for our Great Lakes provides for harbors and channels to permit the economical movement of the vast natural resources tributary thereto. The connecting channels of the Great Lakes system carry more commerce than any other waterway in the world, including the Suez and Panama canals. Of the great ports of the world, Duluth exceeds the tonnage of the port of London. The resulting saving in transportation costs in a single year exceeds the entire cost of all improvements on the Great Lakes to date.

The benefits resulting from the construction of the Panama Canal by the Army Engineers are well known. The large savings to commerce by reason of the shorter water haul are overshadowed by the importance of the canal as a vital element of our national defense.

The Mississippi system embraces the Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, the Illinois Waterway to the Great Lakes and many other navigable tributaries. The system generally provides for a 9-foot depth, with 35-foot depth available from the Gulf to Baton Rouge (*see* Lakes-to-Gulf Deep Waterway). Increasing use is being made of this great system, principally for the shipment of bulk commodities. In 1937, 74,352,948 tons were carried. The Mississippi has been the scene of our greatest flood-control activities. The Mississippi flood-control plan of 1928, as subsequently modified and extended, had reached such a stage of completion that the Ohio River flood of 1937 was passed to the Gulf without any breaks in the controlling levees. The completion of projected reservoirs on the tributaries of the system and other flood protection works (particularly on the Ohio) will further reduce national flood losses.

The northernmost element of the intracoastal waterway is the Cape Cod Canal which is being widened to 480 feet and deepened to 32 feet. A continuous protected waterway along the Atlantic coast from Trenton on the Delaware River to Key Largo, 63 miles south of Miami, with depths from 7 to 12 feet, is now available. Along the Gulf coast an inland protected waterway has been completed, or planned, from St. Marks River in Florida to Corpus Christi in Texas, a distance of more than 1000 miles, with minimum depth of 9 feet.

The two basic methods of improving our inland waterways are regulation (training the stream to maintain navigable depths, sometimes with the aid of dredging) and canalization (locks and dams). Examples of the former are the

Lower Mississippi (*see* Eads Jetties) and the Missouri; of the latter, the Ohio and Upper Mississippi. Flood control methods include levees²⁰, revetments, flood walls, diversion channels and storage reservoirs (usually on the tributaries). In planning, every effort is made to combine the two basic national needs of navigation and flood control. Irrigation and power development are also considered whenever practicable.

No navigation discussion could be complete without mention of the terminal developments accomplished by commercial and local interests. The terminal facilities on our seacoast, Gulf, Great Lakes and inland waterways harbors in general have no peer in the world.

Plans and estimates for navigation and flood-control developments are made far in advance of the time when their accomplishment becomes economically justified. Preliminary surveys are authorized by the Congress for all probable projects years in advance, and each project is reported upon at length by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, a board composed of completely unbiased senior officers of the Corps of Engineers. Since 1922 Congress has provided lump-sum appropriations for river and harbor work, leaving the rate of work on each approved project to the judgment of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers.

The development of our rivers and harbors has been far more intimately connected with our national history than would be reflected by any recital of dates. Our natural waterways were the arteries of travel and commerce used by the early explorers and settlers. Early commercial development occurred largely adjacent thereto. Railroad growth for a time reduced the use of our inland waterways. Recently, water transport has once again come into its own. For long-distance haul of bulk commodities no more economical means is as yet known to man. A single tow on the Mississippi and Missouri carries as much tonnage as 200 loaded freight cars or three freight trains.

The importance of improved channel and harbor facilities is vividly illustrated by the waterborne commerce of the nation which made use of these facilities during the calendar year 1937. This commerce amounted to 583,000,000 tons, with valuation in excess of \$20,900,000,000, which is about ten times the total cost of channel improvements and maintenance since the beginning of such works by the Federal Government.

COMPILED BY MAJOR WILLIS E. TEALB,
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, FROM OFFICIAL
RECORDS OF THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF ENGINEERS

River Navigation. The primitive means of navigating American rivers was by bull boats (coracles), bark canoes and pirogues; and the whites added to these bateaux, keelboats⁹⁹ and barges. Where the nature of the river permitted, sailing craft were utilized, as on the Hudson, Delaware and Potomac rivers; and it was often possible for ships to ascend far upstream. On such streams as the Connecticut and most of the western rivers, the bateau and keelboat were preferred because rowing or poling were more feasible than sailing.

Boatbuilding was among the earliest activities of the colonists, especially in New England and New Amsterdam, and on Delaware Bay. Flatboats⁹⁹, known also as arks and Kentucky boats, were built at the headwaters of eastern and western rivers for the transportation of produce, coal, cattle, immigrants, etc., and continued in use until after the Civil War. Their number is incalculable, and so is the amount of freight they carried and the number of immigrants they transported, but they were certainly a vital factor in the development and peopling of the West, particularly by way of the Ohio and Tennessee rivers.

Regular packet boats⁹⁹ were rare in the keelboat age on the western rivers, and their services were not long continued, but in the East they existed on the Hudson and Delaware. The Spanish maintained a fleet of "galleys" on the Mississippi for military purposes, and the United States built a number of gunboats during the Revolution and the following years. Gunboats and keelboats were used by the army against the Indians on the western rivers as late as the War of 1812, and thereafter steamboats⁹⁹ took their place. A steam gunboat was an important factor in the victory at Bad Axe⁹⁹ in 1832. From about 1792 to about 1817 there were built on the western rivers approximately sixty ships which were floated downstream and put into ocean service. The practice, however, did not prove economical and was discontinued. A second spurt of ocean vessel building came in the 1840's and many wooden and iron ships were built at Pittsburgh, Marietta and other points for use in world commerce.

Fulton's⁹⁹ *Clermont* was launched on the Hudson in 1807, and a battle royal was soon initiated between river and coastwise steamboats and sailing packets⁹⁹, with the former, of course, destined to eventual victory. Fulton's *Orleans*, or *New Orleans*⁹⁹, was put into operation between Natchez and New Orleans in 1811 and was of some assistance to Jackson's army in 1814 and 1815 (see *New Orleans, Battle of*). Fulton's boats were built with deep hulls which were unsuited to the shallow western rivers and it was not until

Henry Shreve's *Washington* was launched in 1816, with its boilers on the deck, that a craft was found suitable for western river navigation. The title "packet" as applied to the western passenger steamboat was a misnomer, as they rarely operated on schedule, but the eastern river steamboats were more reliable. The use of high-pressure boilers resulted in so many explosions that in 1852 Congress set up a system of licensing and inspection. The average life of a western steamboat was about four years.

By 1850 the railroads⁹⁹ had begun to sap the trade from the steamboats and from the canals⁹⁹ both in East and West. The tremendous volume of transport needed during the Civil War gave the steamboats a new lease of life and this continued for a couple of decades due to the fact that the railroads crossed rather than paralleled the rivers. Barges (the modern form of flatboat) came into general use for carrying coal, oil and other heavy goods and were towed by steamboats. During this second great age of the steamboat, lines of packets were formed and schedules became more honored by observance. "Low water boats" were even developed to cater to mail and passenger needs during the summer. By the 1880's, however, the competition of the railroads parallel to the rivers was rapidly displacing steamboats in the West and had won a victory in the East. It was partially in a desperate sectional effort to block the railroads that the Federal Government was pushed into western river improvements after 1879. A magnificent system of dams and other water controls today make the rivers of the Mississippi basin important highways for heavy freight, such as steel and coal, carried chiefly in barges, and affords a check to railway rates as well as a fruitful dumping ground for legislative pork (see "Pork Barrel").

[C. H. Ambler, *Transportation in the Ohio Valley*; L. D. Baldwin, *Keelboat Age on Western Waters*, E. W. Gould, *Fifty Years on the Mississippi*; G. B. Merrick, *Old Times on the Upper Mississippi*.]

LELAND D. BALDWIN

River Towns of Connecticut, THE, were Windsor, Hartford and Wethersfield, together with Springfield until it was discovered that the latter lay within the boundaries of Massachusetts. The settlement of these towns represented a group migration⁹⁹, begun in the summer of 1635 and continued through 1636, from Massachusetts Bay Colony⁹⁹. Thus, practically the whole of the Bay town of Dorchester⁹⁹ removed to Windsor; Newtown (Cambridge) removed to Hartford; Watertown removed to Wethersfield. For a short time the original Massachusetts town names were applied to the new settlements on the Connecticut River.

Various reasons were given for the removals, but probably the motivating reason lay in that urge which during the next two and a half centuries drew Americans ever westward. With this migration from the Bay to the Connecticut the Westward Movement⁹⁹ began.

And, interestingly enough, these Massachusetts pioneers found themselves in a situation which came to be a commonplace of western settlement: they were squatters, though they knew not the word, on land to which no clear title was available. The legal title lay with the Council for New England⁹⁹ which, however, at a series of meetings held in London from February to April, 1635, had voted to surrender its patent to the king and had divided its domain between its eight active members. To the Earl of Carlisle had gone the parcel on which the three River Towns of Windsor, Hartford and Wethersfield were established. There is no evidence that the settlers of these towns asked, or received, any authorization from the Council or from Carlisle.

Simultaneously with the migration of the settlers from Massachusetts and the legal activities of the Council in London, a group of Puritan "lords and gentlemen"⁹⁹ in England put forth a claim to the Connecticut country through a deed or patent allegedly derived from the Earl of Warwick (*see Connecticut, The Old Patent of*), and in the summer of 1635 sent over young John Winthrop as governor, and with orders to build a fort at Saybrook. The settlers of the River Towns made no objection to the fort, but promptly ejected a party which attempted to take up land where Windsor was to be founded. Nor were the agents of the Plymouth trading post⁹⁹, which had been established in the same neighborhood some two years earlier, treated with more consideration. The Massachusetts people had come to take the land, they had the man power to do it, and neither legal title nor claims of title nor incidental prior occupation was to stand in their way.

Possession of the land was promptly followed by the establishment of a federated form of government under a General Court⁹⁹, the first meeting of which, on April 26, 1636, was presided over by Roger Ludlow, former deputy governor of Massachusetts Bay and the leader of the migration.

With the growth of the original settlements, the founding of new towns and the adoption of the Fundamental Orders⁹⁹, the River Towns evolved into the commonwealth of Connecticut.

[R. V. Coleman, *The Old Patent of Connecticut*.]

R. V. COLEMAN

Rivermen of the Ohio. The first rivermen of the Ohio were Indians of the canoe⁹⁹ age of navigation. Long before the coming of white men the Indians had standardized their craft. Then as now the fabrication of river craft was an art, and ports of entry and departure were determined by land routes of travel. As the Indian craft were well suited to the needs of white explorers and traders, they were taken over by them. When white immigrants began to push into the Ohio Valley⁹⁹, larger and more substantial craft than canoes were needed for the transportation of the ever-increasing numbers of people, their household and kitchen furnishings and their livestock. This led to the flatboat and the keelboat⁹⁹ and their numerous modifications. The operators of these craft were known as rivermen, of whom Mike Fink and others were notorious.

In time the half-horse and half-alligator Fink type of men of flatboat and keelboat days gave place to the rousters, gamblers and bullies of the passenger packet⁹⁹ days of Ohio River navigation. While the rousters, notably the Negroes, were making a place for themselves in verse and song, gamblers in the cloistered retreats of the passenger packets lay in wait for "gullible folk" whom they gamed out of their cash and in some instances of their clothing and their Negro slaves. Meanwhile by fighting like bulldogs, chewing and biting, bullies kept alive the traditions of the keelboatmen; others, for instance Enoch Enochs, became notorious for petty pilfering; and the bargemen⁹⁹ developed a class of rivermen all their own.

The best human products of the heyday of the passenger packet on the Ohio, which extended from about 1840 to about 1855, were its gentlemen captains. In dress and bearing they rivaled the ocean captains of that day, and many of them were very popular. As described by one Gurley in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*: "The cusses put on as much airs as the New York ocean captains." Following the Civil War the passenger packet captains recovered a measure of their former elegance, but the present rivermen of the Ohio are the captains, pilots, engineers and rousters who man tuglike boats which, like ships that pass in the night, make few or no stops. They are products of the machine age.

[C. H. Ambler, *A History of Transportation in the Ohio Valley*; Walter Blair and F. J. Meine, *Mike Fink, King of Mississippi Keelboatmen*; A. B. Hulbert, *The Ohio River, A Course of Empire*.]

C. H. AMBLER

Rivers. The rivers of eastern America played a major part in the settlement and early development of the country. First, they were avenues of

exploration. Even where the stream was not navigable, its valley or gorge frequently offered the best route for travel on foot or horseback, and it was a thread or clue by which one might find one's way to the outer world. Next, settlement followed river courses into the interior, and for a long time there was scarcely a hamlet or a trading post that did not have water connection with the coast. The rivers soon became great arteries of traffic, carrying the products of the back country⁹⁹ down to the cities and seaports. From the vast forests of Maine the St. Croix, Penobscot, Kennebec, Androscoggin, Saco and Piscataqua (where there was a sawmill as early as 1631, making lumber, shingles and barrel staves) through the better part of three centuries bore millions of logs downstream until the forests were depleted. The Merrimac, until the coming of the railroads, bore a goodly portion of New Hampshire's products, principally timber and granite, to towns below, and especially to her nearest large market, Boston. Parts of New Hampshire, however, and Vermont, depended upon the Connecticut. Northwestern Vermont and northern New York traded via the Richelieu and St. Lawrence with Quebec and Montreal.

Up the western tributaries of the Susquehanna and Potomac thousands of emigrants during the 18th century toiled, crossed the watershed and followed the Youghiogheny, Monongahela, Conemaugh and Allegheny downward to populate the Ohio Valley⁹⁹. Thereafter, the mountains behind them became a wall which shut them off from their kind on the Atlantic coast. The great Mississippi River⁹⁹ system became their highway; their natural markets were the French towns, St. Louis and New Orleans. They favored the War of 1812⁹⁹ because they dreamed of a conquest of Canada and a new commercial outlet to the east through control of the St. Lawrence River. Washington and others warned that if better connections were not established with them, their allegiance might follow their trade down the Mississippi to the Spaniard. That river system influenced all their thinking until the railroads⁹⁹ began cutting across the natural trade routes.

Farther southward, emigrants from Virginia and the Carolinas pushed up the James, the Dan, the Yadkin and the Catawba, through the mountains, to populate southwestern Virginia and northeastern Tennessee. The men of that region, in signifying their allegiance to the Revolution, spoke of themselves as "Men of the settlements beyond the Alleghenies, where the Watauga and the Holston flow to the Tennessee." Some of the earliest settlers of Nashville⁹⁹ left a fort on the Holston on Dec. 22, 1779, journeyed down

the Holston and the Tennessee in flatboats, to the mouth of the latter, worked up to the mouth of the Cumberland and traveled up the Cumberland to the site of Nashville, which they reached, on April 24, 1780, after a journey of some 1300 miles (*see* Cumberland Settlements).

Down the lower Atlantic coast were many broad rivers, really estuaries, having tidewater far upstream from their mouths—Patuxent, Chester, Choptank, Nanticoke, Potomac, Rappahannock, York, James, Chowan, Roanoke, Pamlico, Cape Fear, Pedee, Santee, Cooper, St. Johns and others, on which sailing vessels carried much traffic in early days. Great plantations were located on them, the mansions fronting on the river, which was often their chief highway for travel as well as for freight traffic. A number of these fine old manor houses still survive.

Rivers wholly impossible for steamboat travel carried vast quantities of pioneer products down to market in arks and flatboats⁹⁹ on the spring freshets. With the coming of steam and before railroads conquered the river traffic, steamboats⁹⁹ were placed on small, swift rivers, especially in the Middle West and South, where such navigation was later considered impracticable, and where the boat must be of such light draft that it could, as was jokingly said, "run on a heavy dew." It is a fact that steamboats traveled where channels were so narrow that they could not turn around save by backing into the mouth of a tributary stream. Such boats could operate only in parts of the winter and spring, when the water was high and there was not too much ice. Such a river is the Cumberland, where boats once ran 150 miles or more above Nashville, and the stream was so tortuous that it was said a town might hear a boat whistle across a bend in the early morning and not see the craft until late afternoon.

In California⁹⁹, when the Gold Rush began in 1849, the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers were almost the only feasible highways of travel from San Francisco to the mining regions. There were no steamboats, and many gold-seekers paid high fees for passage upstream in a skiff or yawl, with the understanding that they were to help with the rowing. Others traveled in slow-moving sailing vessels. A steamer built in New York for the Atlantic coast trade went safely around Cape Horn⁹⁹ and began operating on the Sacramento; and until another one followed it four months later, its rates were so high that it earned \$20,000 or more on a round trip. The Columbia River⁹⁹ likewise became the highway after 1855 to and from the coast for the mining regions of Idaho and northeastern Washington.

Rivers have played an important part in the nation's warfare. The French and Indian War⁹⁷ was fought almost entirely along rivers or intervening lakes. The French came down the Allegheny to seize the forks of the Ohio and build Fort Duquesne⁹⁸. Washington marched by the Potomac, Wills Creek and the Youghiogheny on his ill-fated expedition of 1754 (*see* Great Meadows), and Braddock⁹⁹, a year later, traversed the same route to his death. The Ohio River was perhaps the most noted pathway of Indian warfare in our history. The upper Missouri¹⁰⁰ was for decades the scene of frequent Indian attacks upon white trappers, traders and settlers. Much of the Revolutionary War fighting in New York State was done on, or immediately near, the Hudson and Mohawk rivers (*see* Burgoyne's Invasion). Washington heavily fortified and blocked the Hudson at West Point¹⁰¹ to prevent British penetration of its upper reaches; André¹⁰² went up the stream on a British vessel to his fatal conference with Arnold¹⁰³, and the latter escaped downstream on the same vessel. In the Civil War the Potomac, the Rapidan, Rappahannock, North Anna, Chickahominy and James were important strategic barriers in the East, along which armies aligned themselves or fought. The division of McClellan's army by the Chickahominy in the Seven Days' Battles¹⁰⁴ came near being its ruin. The Potomac below Washington was a highway by which the North could move armies quickly to block the mouth of the James. In mid-West and South the Mississippi and its tributaries were among the chief objects of strategy. The Confederate forts Henry and Donelson¹⁰⁵ were built to block the Tennessee and Cumberland rivers respectively, and when they fell, early in 1862, the South had received a penetrating blow. The seizure of the Mississippi in 1863 (*see* Mississippi, Opening of the) split the Confederacy in twain and presaged its downfall. The Tennessee River was the route by which Grant's army was provisioned when it reached Chattanooga in the autumn of 1863, and the Battle of Wauhatchie¹⁰⁶ was fought to keep it open. The Red River¹⁰⁷ (Southern) was the scene of an important but unsuccessful Federal expedition in 1864, aimed at Texas. Meanwhile, the white settlements strung along the Minnesota River had been the victims of the terrible Sioux uprising of 1862¹⁰⁸.

[Esther Singleton, ed., *Great Rivers of the World.*]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Rivers in American Diplomacy. The drainage system of North America, and the territorial expansion of the United States westward across it, have given to the great rivers (notably the Mis-

issippi, Rio Grande and Columbia) an important geographical role in American diplomacy.

The Mississippi Question was one of the first major diplomatic issues. Spain denied that the United States (after 1783) extended to that river, at least below the Ohio, and refused to admit any right of the citizens of the United States to free navigation of the stream through Spanish Territory. Spain's distresses in Europe impelled her in 1795 to concede the imperfect American claims in Pinckney's Treaty¹⁰⁹. After the retrocession of New Orleans and Louisiana by Spain to France in 1800 (*see* San Ildefonso, Treaty of), Spain in 1802 revoked the "right of deposit"¹¹⁰ established in this treaty, and the consequent alarm of American western citizens, who saw in the revocation an augury of the character of future French control of the river, induced President Jefferson to send Robert R. Livingston to Paris to try to buy New Orleans, with the astonishing result of the procurement of all Louisiana¹¹¹. Jay's Treaty¹¹² of 1794 had guaranteed to British subjects and American citizens the free navigation of the river, a provision which was not renewed after the War of 1812 put an end to it.

The Rio Grande¹¹³ River was claimed, somewhat expansively, by the Republic of Texas¹¹⁴, as its boundary with Mexico. Mexico's refusal to negotiate a settlement of this boundary after the annexation of Texas¹¹⁵ by the United States, and her declaration (April 23, 1846) of war on the United States, precipitated war. Hostilities began when Mexican forces crossed the Rio Grande on April 25. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo¹¹⁶ fixed the boundary at the Rio Grande as far north as El Paso. The changing course of the river bed has subsequently caused boundary controversies (Chamizal tract at El Paso). A convention of 1889 provided an International Boundary Commission of one Mexican and one American representative to assist the peaceful regulation of such controversies arising by "natural causes" along the Rio Grande or Colorado rivers.

The Columbia River¹¹⁷ played an epochal part in the exploration, settlement and territorial claims of the Pacific Northwest (*see* Oregon Question). The British government contended that the Columbia River from its intersection with 49° N. Lat. to the sea was the boundary of British North America, but in the Oregon Treaty of 1846¹¹⁸ abandoned this position and accepted the line of 49 degrees to the sea, with the provision, however, that British subjects trading with the Hudson's Bay Company¹¹⁹ were to enjoy the free navigation of the entire river. (This provision, now archaic, has never caused

any serious discussion between the two governments.) Other rivers flowing through both British and American territory, the St. John, the Stikine, the Yukon, Porcupine and the St. Lawrence, have been opened to joint navigation by treaty arrangement.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*; Eugene Schuyler, *American Diplomacy and the Furtherance of Commerce*.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Rivington's Gazette (1773-83) was one of the more important colonial newspapers^o, with a circulation that extended into several colonies. James Rivington named his paper *Rivington's New York Gazetteer, or the Connecticut, New Jersey, Hudson's River, and Quebec Weekly Advertiser* but this title was soon shortened. It was a strongly partisan sheet, favoring the Tories^o during the Revolution. A group of armed Patriots destroyed Rivington's press in November, 1775, and forced suspension of the paper until October, 1777, when it was revived under the patronage of the king's government. The *Gazette* was useful to the English in publishing proclamations, revealing the misrepresentations of Patriot newspapers, and in perpetrating misrepresentations to aid the Loyalists^o. Rivington remained in New York City at the end of the war, trying to continue publication, but the last issue printed was Dec. 31, 1783. Thereafter he continued business only as a bookseller.

[Isaiah Thomas, *History of Printing in America*.]

CHARLES MARION THOMAS

Road Agents. See Bandits.

Road Survey Bill (1824). See Survey Act of 1824, The General.

Road Working Days. Until the development of modern highways in the motor vehicle era, the "working out of road taxes" was a common system in rural America. A regular scale of payment was allowed for men, horses and equipment, and work was in charge of township or road district supervisors. "Road working days" were usually fixed at a time when farm work was not pressing and were occasions for neighborhood gossip and jollification rather than hard work. Construction was almost always unsatisfactory, and abolition of the system was one of the first recommendations of the "good roads" movement^o. Increasing technical demands and the rigid requirements of state and Federal aid have served to eliminate the system in most localities, and taxes are paid in cash.

[G. R. Chatburn, *Highways and Highway Transportation*.]

W. A. ROBINSON

Roads. America's first roadmakers were none other than the ruminant bison. Centuries before the white man came these awkward bovine creatures had made "traces" over the length and breadth of the vast Mississippi Valley and through parts of the Rocky and Appalachian mountains. The buffalo traces^o were not only our first roads but for the early period of American history they were the best. And like the road systems of today they were both local and transcontinental in character. The former were those which converged upon the green meadows, the salt licks^o and the stamping grounds, while the latter were those mile-wide tracks leading from one vast feeding ground to another. As road engineers the buffalo were unexcelled. They ingeniously and invariably selected the easiest and at the same time the most practical routes to the watersheds. As such, they provided the pioneer with an "Ascent and Descent tollerably easie" to and from his much desired "high ground."

Popular fancy associates the pre-Columbian red men with bark and birch canoes^o, whereas in reality most of them had to walk. At one time a network of Indian trails spread over America; and although buffalo traces were not infrequently used by the aborigines, the two should not be confused with each other. For one thing Indian trails existed in regions unfrequented by bison, for another they tended to be deep rather than wide. But Indians, like the buffalo, followed the lines of least resistance, and they too cut through important mountain passes, wound over portages, followed the watersheds, and as such they likewise blazed trails for white traders, trappers and missionaries. And finally, as a Cayuga chief once put it: trails that the red men "have trod for centuries; trails worn so deep by the feet of the Iroquois" gradually became, as the lands of the pale face "ate into" those of the Indian, the wagon roads of a later era.

England's first colonists comprised a tidewater and river civilization, but before long there emerged a nonriparian element which, out of necessity, brought about distinct changes in existing modes of travel and transportation. The "trodden paths" of the Indians, while not discarded, were soon widened by the extensive use the colonists made of ox sledges and of pack horses. The bulky horse packs soon wore away the overhanging boughs, while the constant passing of pack trains and the dragging of sledges gradually widened the trails in preparation, as it were, for the coming of wheeled vehicles.

Early roads, however, did not come about entirely without the conscious and deliberate work of man. As early as 1639 the Massachusetts Bay

Colony⁹⁹ court ordered that roads be laid out so as to provide "ease and safety for travelers; and for this end every town shall choose two or three men, who shall join with two or three of the next town, and these shall have power to lay out the highways in each town where they may be most convenient. . . ." The New England township system likewise specified the construction of roads. With the establishment of government in other colonies—particularly in New York and Pennsylvania—one finds similar official steps taken for the construction of roads and bridges. Even in the Virginia Statutes at Large for the period 1619–60 one reads that highways shall be "layd out" and that "surveyors of highwaies and maintenance for bridges be yearly kept and appointed in each countie court respectively." Colonial laws pertaining to roads should not be taken too seriously. As the result of official action, precious little was done toward actual improvement in the means of overland transportation, with the exception of occasional tree and stump clearings.

In 1685 private coaches appeared on Boston's cobbled streets for the first time. But the increase in vehicles was slow, and not until the middle of the next century were they widely used. The inauguration of stagecoach⁹⁹ passenger and mail service, and the introduction (particularly in Pennsylvania) of the Conestoga wagon⁹⁹ freight business during the 18th century, provided the necessary inducement for road improvements. So extensive were these improvements that at the time of the Revolutionary War there existed dirt and corduroy roads throughout the more thickly settled areas of the northern and central colonies with thoroughfares even extending into the normally aquatic-minded Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia.

Land companies were not without their effect upon early road building, for certainly it was under the auspices of the Ohio and Transylvania companies⁹⁹⁹ that the first trails were blazed into the Old Northwest⁹⁹ and Kentucky respectively. It was in March, 1775, under the direction of the Transylvania Company, that Daniel Boone and his party left the Watauga, where the Treaty of Sycamore Shoals⁹⁹ had just been completed, to cut a wagon trail into Kentucky. From just north of Long Island of Holston the route moved west through Cumberland Gap, north for fifty miles along "Warriors' Path" and then again west through dense forests to the Kentucky River where Boone founded the town of Boonesborough⁹⁹⁹. This route was fittingly called "Wilderness Road"⁹⁹⁹; and in view of the thousands of settlers who jolted their way over it en route

to old "Kaintuck," it is scarcely without a peer among the historic highways of the land.

The rapid development of civilization in trans-Appalachia at the opening of the national period was accompanied by an acute transportation problem. Heavy goods were floated on the rivers, but Spanish possession of the mouth of the Mississippi created a potentially dangerous national situation (*see* Mississippi River, Free Navigation of; Western Separatism). It was partly to overcome this hazard and partly to establish faster means of communication between the East and the West that the new United States Government took steps toward the construction of roads under Federal auspices. In the act of 1802 granting statehood to Ohio provision was made for an East-West road—a road which, when extended, was destined to become the famous National, or Cumberland, Road⁹⁹.

Toward this end science lent a hand. It had been discovered by John Loudon MacAdam, a Scotchman, that if crushed rock of less than one inch diameter were spread on either a dirt or stone foundation ten inches deep, the roadbeds would become not only harder but stronger with use (*see* Hard Roads). During 1792–94 the Philadelphia and Lancaster Turn Pike Company had demonstrated this superior roadmaking method by constructing a sixty-six mile toll turnpike road between the above-named cities, albeit at a cost of \$465,000. It "is a masterpiece of its kind," wrote Francis Bailly, a traveler; "it is paved with stone the whole way, and overlaid with gravel, so that it is never obstructed during the most severe season."

The immense flow of freighters, stagecoaches and ordinary vehicles over the Lancaster Turnpike⁹⁹ was sufficient revelation to the Federal authorities not only of the practicability of this new method of road building but of the volume of traffic that would accompany the construction of well-built roads through populous areas. Now, with a crying demand from the West for better transportation facilities, the Government was ready to act. Congress, as stated, first took action leading to construction of the Cumberland Road in 1802—a road from Cumberland, Md., to Wheeling, Va. (now W. Va.). Then in 1806 the decision was reached to expand it into a national road to extend from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mississippi River (St. Louis), and it was toward this end that actual construction began two years later. Constitutional questions were raised; and due to political obstructionism it was not until about 1819 that the road reached Wheeling. Thereafter the National Road continued to be a political football, and while new surveys and

constructions were occasionally made, it never got beyond Vandalia, Ill., which point it reached in 1852. As far as Terre Haute, Ind., the road was superbly built—in keeping with MacAdam's principles—but from that point west it remained a dirt road. Although tolls were collected, its success from a social and economic point was unquestioned. "As many as twenty four-horse coaches have been counted in line at one time on the road," wrote one of the early historians of the National Road, "and large broad-wheeled wagons, . . . laden with merchandise and drawn by six Conestoga horses were visible all the day at every point, . . . besides innumerable caravans of horses, mules, cattle, hogs and sheep." The financial burden which this enterprise entailed and the protracted fight over the constitutionality of internal improvements⁷⁰ contributed to a reduction of Federal road aid by Jackson's time (*see* Maysville Veto), and ultimately the National Road was completely abandoned by Congress and was ceded to the states through which it passed. This likewise appears to have been the fate of other Federal or pseudo-Federal roads, which during the early decades of the 19th century had been built for military or social purposes. The coming of the railroads⁷¹ to America by 1828 was likewise a factor explaining why, at this time, the United States Government left the matter of road building to state, county and private agencies, which, if their accomplishments in both road and canal⁷² construction during the decades of the 1830's and 1840's are an index, were only too happy to assume this responsibility. Not until the advent of the automobile⁷³, early in the 20th century, did the Federal Government again become a prominent road builder.

It has often been stated that as frontier society moved steadily westward it repeated certain phases of its evolutionary social processes. This idea is particularly applicable to the subject of roads. During the time of the construction of the Cumberland Road the Far West was still a land of Indian trails. Before long, fur traders and missionaries were headed for the Oregon country⁷⁴ and in so doing they marked out what by 1841 became widely known as the Oregon Trail⁷⁵—a route extending from St. Joseph, Mo., to the Willamette Valley, Oreg., a route which in a rough way followed the south bank of the Platte River⁷⁶, and after passing through South Pass⁷⁷ moved along the Green and Snake rivers and then over Immigrants Pass to the banks of the Columbia. By following or floating down this massive river gorge the immigrants could reach their destination. In 1843 nearly 1000 pioneers moved westward over the Oregon Trail and for

many succeeding years the number remained large. Less permanent, but nevertheless of historical significance, were such routes as the Santa Fé and Mormon trails⁷⁸.

With the discovery of gold in California⁷⁹ in 1848 migration westward took on greater magnitude. Many who lived on the Atlantic seaboard preferred either a five-month sea voyage or the fever-ridden Isthmus route to overland travel. But most of the argonauts⁸⁰ from the Middle West used the Oregon Trail to a point slightly west of Fort Hall⁸¹ (Idaho) and from there they turned southward and continued on over the thirsty Carson Sink, across the high Sierras south of Lake Tahoe and on to Hangtown, Calif. Within a decade following the gold discovery California's population rose from a mere 15,000 to almost 380,000, half of which are believed to have passed over the seemingly endless stretches of the Oregon-California Trail. In view of this sudden rush of people into California, nearly half of which hastened off to almost inaccessible mountain retreats, the transportation difficulties seemed insurmountable. It was not long, however, before some trails were converted into passable roadways, and as early as the autumn of 1849 teamsters, using horses, mules, or oxen, were able to haul supplies to some of the more accessible mining towns. And while local and private agencies did much toward the construction of roads, bridges and ferries, we have the words of the Britisher Frank Marryat that "no one knows what a wagon will undergo until he has mastered California trails and gulches."

Hardly had the settlers and miners come to the Pacific coast before they commenced to clamor for a transcontinental railroad. Surveys for such were made, but to discerning persons it was then clearly evident that years would elapse before such a costly enterprise could be consummated. And so the "claim of the people of the West," to use the words of Congressman R. H. Stanton in 1850, "to have an immediate, safe, and practical overland route, to serve until a railroad is built, I think fair, reasonable, righteous, and a constitutional claim." It took much congressional debating before action came, but in 1857 the Overland California Mail Bill became a law. And while this measure did not prescribe Federal aid in road construction, it did empower the Postmaster General to provide a liberal subsidy to a firm which he might select "for the conveyance of the entire letter mail from . . . the Mississippi River . . . to San Francisco. . . ." The route selected and provided ran from St. Louis to Little Rock, and then through El Paso and Yuma to its western terminus. It

became popularly known as the Butterfield, or Southern Overland route⁷⁷, and between 1858-61 a semiweekly passenger and mail service was maintained over this road. In 1860 this stage road was extended northward from San Francisco to Portland, Oregon—making a total length of 3600 miles. The outbreak of the Civil War necessitated switching the Butterfield route into northern territory, and thereafter it followed in a general way the old Oregon-California Trail. Not until May 10, 1869, when the first transcontinental railroad (see Union Pacific Railroad) was completed, did this important stage road lose its economic significance and popularity.

The great expansion and the excellence of the American railway system partly account for the protracted lull in good road building during the last part of the 19th century. But significantly enough the Federal Government was once again to become interested in roads. In 1893 Congress appropriated \$10,000 for an inquiry into good road management. With the advent and use of the automobile after 1900 this renewed interest increased in view of the inadequacy of state and county roads for motor travel. Just what the condition of American roads was as late as 1908 may be indicated by the fact that there was then not a single mile of concrete highway, and only 650 miles of macadam, in the entire United States. For directions to go from Albuquerque to Los Angeles in 1908 the secretary of an automobile club was typically enough told to: "Follow this mountain range eighty miles south to a stick in the fork of a road, with a paper tied at the top. Take the rut that leads off to the right."

In 1912 a plan was proposed for the construction of a direct transcontinental road to be called the Lincoln Highway⁷⁸. And while this enterprise was not completed until 1930, it marks the beginning of widespread Federal and state aid for highway construction, much of which was to be hard surfaced.

By the outbreak of the World War, highway construction was actually getting under way on a national scale (see Rural Post Roads Act). And so great has been the increase since that in 1936 the Federal Government alone spent \$489,000,000 for highway work. The plan now generally followed sets up a system of National and state highways to be improved and maintained by the states through their respective highway departments (see Federal Highway Act). And as for secondary roads, these are left to the jurisdiction of county and township officials.

The Federal and state governments have established an unromantic numbering system which,

though obliterating the identity of scores of historic road names, has proved a boon to the tourist.

America is now on wheels and the public demands for better roads are persistent. Largely through the gasoline and automobile taxes, enormous funds for highway construction and maintenance become available. In view of this, the present two-lane highways which cross and recross the nation are beginning to give way to four-, six-, and eight-lane concrete superhighways, or to elevated roads which provide greater speed, safety and beauty. Likewise, modern highways are rapidly losing their state and National character and are becoming international. Highways for years have linked the United States with Canada; and now these same unbroken bands of pavement extend far below the Rio Grande. It is no vain prophecy to say that in the not-too-distant future one will be able to motor with ease and comfort from Alaska to the Argentines.

[Archer Butler Hulbert, *Historic Highways of America*; Seymour Dunbar, *A History of Travel in America*; Malcolm Keir, *The March of Commerce*; Thomas R. Agg and John E. Brindley, *Highway Administration and Finance*.]

OSCAR OSBURN WINTHER

Roads: Good Roads Movement, THE. Organized bicycle⁷⁹ riders furnished the first popular demand for good roads. With the development of low-priced automobiles⁸⁰ the demand greatly increased; and following the first decade of the 20th century state aid for road construction became practically universal, the first Federal Aid Road Act⁸¹ being passed in 1916. Funds came from poll taxes⁸², general property taxes and bond issues. Automobile license fees, at first designed merely to cover cost of registration and gasoline taxes, started in 1919 in four states, eventually came to supply the bulk of road construction and maintenance funds. By act of Congress, 1921, the Federal Government began giving, through the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads, financial assistance to the states, as the states had given aid to counties, and such funds had been gradually increased from less than \$100,000,000 annually, until in 1937 they amounted to approximately \$330,000,000 annually, and in total to over \$1,000,000,000 in the period 1921-37, not including emergency appropriations made for use of other Federal Government agencies. Altogether, the amount of money raised by taxes for road construction had reached over \$1,000,000,000 a year by 1936, but approximately 20% of such funds was by then being diverted to other than road purposes.

[N. S. Shaler, *American Highways*; T. R. Agg and J.

E. Brindley, *Highway Administration and Finance*; V. O. Key, *The Administration of Federal Grants to States*.]

NATHAN C. ROCKWOOD

Roanoke, Settlement at. See Raleigh's Patent and First Colony; Raleigh's Lost Colony.

Roanoke Island, The Capture of, was accomplished Feb. 8, 1862, by Gen. A. E. Burnside (U.) with an overwhelming force of vessels and men, operating against weakly fortified positions. The capture of this strategic island enabled Federal troops to occupy Elizabeth City and to overrun many North Carolina counties bordering on Albemarle Sound.

[S. A. Ashe, *History of North Carolina*, Vol. II.]

RICHARD E. YATES

Robbery. See Bandits; Gangsters.

Robinson, Fort (Neb.), was located on White River at the Red Cloud agency. It was built by the United States Army in 1874 after the worst of the Indian fighting was over, and was used, for the most part, to maintain order among the Sioux^w warriors recently subdued and settled there, to distribute rations, and as a remount depot. Most of the famous Sioux chiefs were at some time located there, and Crazy Horse was killed there.

[J. S. Morton, *Illustrated History of Nebraska*.]

CARL L. CANNON

Robinson-Patman Act, THE (1936), was primarily intended to protect the independent merchant against the preferential wholesale prices which chain stores^w were able to command because of their great purchasing volume. It prohibited discrimination in price or terms of sale between purchases of commodities of like grade or quality, prohibited questionable brokerage or advertising allowances, and attempted to prevent the setting of unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition.

[*Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act*, Pub. No. 692, 74th Cong., 2d Session.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Rochester Rappings was the name given to spiritual manifestations reported by Margaret and Kate Fox as having occurred at their home in Hydesville, N. Y. (1848), and later at their sister's home in Rochester (1849). With these rappings on walls and furniture, spiritualism^w started in the United States. Later the Foxes confessed faking, but spiritualism continued.

AUGUSTUS H. SHEARER

Rock Island Bridge Case (1857), known also as the *Effie Afton* case (officially, *Hurd v. Rail-*

road Bridge Co.), was a suit for damages which grew out of the collision, in 1856, of the steamer *Effie Afton* with the newly erected railroad bridge connecting Rock Island, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa. Basically, it was a contest between river and rail transportation and their respective interests. The trial, in the U. S. Circuit Court at Chicago, was made notable not only by the issues involved but also by the participation of Abraham Lincoln and other prominent lawyers. The jury failed to reach a verdict.

[A. J. Beveridge, *Abraham Lincoln, 1809-58*.]

PAUL M. ANGLE

Rockefeller Foundation, THE, was established by John D. Rockefeller, and chartered, May 14, 1913, under the laws of the State of New York, "to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world." Within a few years after its organization, Mr. Rockefeller had conveyed to the Foundation approximately \$182,000,000. By the end of 1937 the grants made from income and capital had totaled \$274,000,000.

During its first fifteen years, the Foundation gave its support almost entirely to the advancement of public health^w and the medical sciences. It took over and enlarged the program of the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission for the Eradication of Hookworm^w Disease in the Southern states, which Mr. Rockefeller had founded in 1909. The early efforts to control the hookworm had led to co-operation with various public agencies, with emphasis on improving the efficacy of measures against preventable diseases. Work of this character extended into many lands. The need for adequate personnel attracted attention to projects in medical education and public health training, and assistance in the building, organizing and development of strategically placed schools of medicine and of public health became an important interest. In 1929 the program was rounded out to include also assistance to projects in the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities.

In all these activities, the Foundation addresses itself primarily to the advancement of knowledge. In the medical sciences, its program emphasizes research in psychiatry; in the natural sciences, experimental biology; in public health, efforts are centered on the development of personnel and on the study and control of certain diseases (malaria, rabies, tuberculosis, yaws and syphilis, yellow fever); in the social sciences, on international relations, social security and public administration; and in the humanities, on efforts which tend to raise the general cultural level and promote cultural exchanges between

countries. These defined objectives serve as guiding marks in an effort to give the program a reasonable degree of concentration.

Except in the field of public health, the Foundation is not an operating organization and conducts no researches. Its activities are confined largely to the support of other agencies—universities, laboratories, research institutes—and to the training, through fellowship grants, of competent personnel in the various fields of its interest. Since 1915 more than 6000 persons have studied under such fellowships.

The policies of the Rockefeller Foundation are determined by a self-perpetuating board of unsalaried trustees.

[*President's Review of the Work of the Rockefeller Foundation; Annual Report of the Rockefeller Foundation.*]

RAYMOND B. FOSDICK

Rocky Mountain Fur Company, THE (1822–34), was a simple partnership of traders. An announcement published in St. Louis, upon behalf of William H. Ashley, on March 20, 1822, asked for the enlistment of “one hundred young men to ascend the Missouri River to its source, there to be employed for one, two, or three years.” The business agreement behind this announcement marked the beginning of the company (see Ashley Expeditions). The company later passed under control of other partners, of whom Jedediah S. Smith, David Jackson and William L. Sublette were the best known.

This company, in its brief history, opened up the wealthiest fur sections of the West. It was the first company to depend primarily upon directly trapping beaver rather than securing the skins by trading with the Indians. Knowledge of the geography of the West was greatly increased by the explorations incidental to the activities of its members. The regions of the Platte, Green, Yellowstone and Snake rivers were explored by them. The region around the Great Salt Lake was trapped, and Smith^{tr} made his way from there into California, and then along the coast into Oregon, being the first white man known to have covered most of this great distance. Guides for later fur trade and settlement enterprises received their training with this company.

[Hiram M. Chittenden, *The American Fur Trade of the Far West.*]

ROBERT MOULTON GATKE

Rocky Mountains, THE, have played a basic role in American history, for geography decisively affects the course of human events. “History is geography in motion.” Mountain topography alters climate and rainfall, largely determines the flora and fauna, and these in turn affect

aboriginal and modern human inhabitants.

Spanish pioneers were the first white men to see the Rocky Mountains, first in Mexico and then (Coronado^{tr}, 1540) in the United States. The geologic upheaval that produced the Rocky Mountains had brought the conditions for ore-making. And the presence of the precious metals induced the earliest exploration and first settlements, by Spaniards in the southern portion of the Rockies.

From the East, via the Great Lakes^{tr}, came the French. As early as 1743, Verendrye^{tr} saw the “Shining Mountains” in the Wyoming region. Frenchmen and then Englishmen, hunting furs, followed Canadian streams to the western mountains. Then came pelt-hungry Americans up the Missouri^{tr} and its tributaries. These trappers and traders, first gathering beaver skins and later buffalo robes, became the Mountain Men^{tr} who were the real trail-blazers of the central Rocky Mountain West. Their pack trains, and later their wagons, broke the practicable trails into and over the mountains.

The Louisiana Purchase^{tr} of 1803 was without definite boundaries, but the original French claim to the drainage area of the Mississippi indicated the crest of the Rockies as the western boundary. Lewis and Clark in the Northwest, and Z. M. Pike^{tr} in the Southwest, led the first official expeditions for the United States into the Rocky Mountains. Their reports were more favorable than that of Maj. Long^{tr} (1820), who came to the base of the mountains and labeled the adjoining high plains, “The Great American Desert.” To the west-moving flood of homeseekers these plains, the Rocky Mountains and intervening plateaus were uninviting for settlement and they traveled another thousand miles to the Pacific coast, over trails determined by mountain topography. In southern Wyoming, where the Rockies flatten to a high plain, South Pass became the gateway to Oregon^{tr}. The Mormon trek (1847) and the rush of the Forty-niners^{tr} to California took the same crossing of the continental divide. Gold discoveries during the 1850's and 1860's brought permanent settlement in the Rockies, and the formation of the mountain states (see Pikes Peak Gold Rush).

The agriculture that followed mining in the West was determined by the mountains. The high regions catch the snows that make the rivers, and these feed the irrigation^{tr} canals that make farming possible in the semiarid country. These same geographical factors later brought reservoirs, reclamation and transmontane water diversion. The vital importance of mountain watershed protection brought national forest

conservation. Lumbering became an important industry in the better wooded areas of the Rockies.

The locations of cities and towns were fixed by the mountain geography. When the transcontinental railroads came, the Rocky Mountains determined the routes. Lines were turned and twisted from direct courses by mountain topography. The automobile highways have been similarly directed.

Mountain geography usually retards civilization in its immediate area. Although in most of the Rocky Mountain region the period of civilized habitation has been rather short, the effects of these natural forces are already noticeable in the backwardness of certain of the more isolated mountain settlements.

LEROY R. HAFEN

Rodeos, or roundups, may be considered (1) as factors of the range industry, and (2) as public spectacles.

The first ranching (Spanish) in America was on the open range^o, and open-range conditions existed through a long period of expansion of the industry by English-speaking rangemen, until the advent of barbed wire^o. Cattle and horses on the open range always drift, fences not altogether confining them. As a result, the working of stock on any unfenced range concerned neighboring—and even far distant—stockmen as much as the immediate controller of that range. While Texas and California were still Mexican territory, laws were added to custom to regulate the gatherings of stock. Riders from far and near participated in these rodeos. A *juez de campo*—judge of the plains—presided with full authority. Beeves and cows were selected for slaughter, their only value on the Pacific slope until in the late 1840's being the worth of hide^o and tallow; colts, calves and unbranded animals were branded (see Cattle Brands); young horses were caught for breaking; *manadas* (bands of mares, each kept in charge by a stallion) were "shaped up"; animals belonging on distant ranges were cut out, etc.

During the 1870's and 1880's, while the Great Plains and adjacent territory developed into the cattle empire, roundups that dwarfed the original rodeos became systematized. Their times, limits and manner of procedure were during their heyday regulated by cattle associations^o of Texas, Colorado, Wyoming and other states. As many as two or three hundred riders—though lesser roundups were far more common—representing scores of brands, fed by dozens of chuck wagons and having in their *remudas*^o from six to ten horses for each rider, would concentrate

against some natural boundary, mountain or stream. The general roundup boss would then direct various units as to each day's work. Daily a big piece of country was "combed" and out of the cattle brought together calves would be branded, beeves held for shipping and strays to be returned to their proper ranges cut out. The "cuts" were kept under herd and were daily driven to each new roundup ground, and thus were constantly augmented. The "work" might end more than 100 miles from where it started.

Rodeos and roundups alike brought together, socially, men leading isolated lives; they were festivals of a kind. Horse racing and betting were inevitable. Fancy riding and expert roping were displayed by horsemen of a class that has always been proud of its "profession" and its expertness. Poker and other games went on upon blankets spread out in the firelight. Cowboys exchanged songs (see Cowboy Songs). Occasionally there was an "augering match"—a contest in storytelling. Long before the range was all fenced in the Southwest, riding and roping contests became popular features of fairs and barbecues^o.

Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show proved the popular interest in a dramatization of the horse-back West. About the opening of the century, Booger Red and other "stove-up" cowpunchers were enterprising bronc-riding exhibitions and charging admission. In 1908 the Millers of Oklahoma put their 101 Ranch exhibition on the road. In 1897 Cheyenne began its annual exhibition, famous now all over the continent as Frontier Days. The Calgary Stampede and the Pendleton Roundup, both started later, are equally famous. These, with the Southwestern Exhibition and Fat Stock Show at Fort Worth, the Last Roundup at Dodge City, rodeos at Miles City, Prescott, Las Vegas, and at many other places, now draw millions of spectators annually. The rodeo is a feature in New York's Madison Square Garden and Chicago's Coliseum; it has been to London. Professionals follow the big rodeos; but all over the range country there are held, each summer and fall, rodeos in which only local talent—ranch people—participate. The rodeo—with its steer and bronc riding, wild-cow milking, bull-dogging, calf roping and other features, has become as much an American institution as bullfighting is Spanish or the Olympic games were Greek.

[Ellsworth Collings and Alma Miller England, *The 101 Ranch*; Chas. W. Furlong, *Let 'Er Buck*; Charles Simpson, *El Rodeo*.]

J. FRANK DOBIE

Rodney's Ride. After Richard Henry Lee's resolution for independence was debated in the

Continental Congress^o on July 1, 1776, one of Delaware's delegates, Thomas McKean, voted for it; another, George Read, voted against it; and the third, Cæsar Rodney, was absent on official business in his home state. According to a letter written by McKean in his old age, he sent a messenger to Rodney urging him to hurry up to Philadelphia to break the tie vote of Delaware. Rodney promptly mounted a fleet horse and, riding with fresh horses at various intervals, a distance of some eighty miles during the night and morning of July 1-2, arrived in time to join McKean in casting Delaware's vote for the Resolution on July 2 when the formal vote of Congress was taken. Read joined McKean and Rodney in signing the Declaration on behalf of Delaware on or after Aug. 2.

[George H. Ryden, ed., *Letters to and from Cæsar Rodney*.]

GEORGE H. RYDEN

Rodríguez-Chamuscado Expedition (1581). In 1580, the Spaniards having occupied northern Mexico, Augustin Rodríguez, a Franciscan^o lay brother serving the missions in this new region, obtained permission to cross the Rio Grande and found a mission among the Pueblo Indians^o. Two Franciscan priests joined him, Francisco López and Juan de Santa Maria. They were accompanied by nine soldiers and some sixteen Mexican Indian converts under the command of Francisco Sánchez Chamuscado. From Santa Bárbara (Chihuahua), on June 5, 1581, they proceeded northward and entered a region near present Bernalillo (N. Mex.). Thence the friars visited the neighboring towns, while Chamuscado led his followers on a tour westward to Pecos, Ácoma and Zuñi^o. The enterprise was soon abandoned, owing to the extravagant conduct of Chamuscado. His domineering policy vexed the soldiers, alienated the peaceful natives and nullified the work of the friars. On his way to Mexico with a report for the viceroy, Juan de Santa Maria was murdered by hostile Indians. In the end, Chamuscado ordered a return to Mexico, leaving the friars without military protection. Both Rodríguez and López were soon after killed by the Indians. Though itself a failure, the expedition paved the way for the permanent occupation of New Mexico by Juan de Oñate^o sixteen years later.

[H. E. Bolton, *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest, and The Spanish Borderlands*.]

FRANCIS BORGLA STECK

Rogerenes, THE (also known as Rogerene Baptists and Rogerene Quakers), were a nonconformist sect founded about 1675-77 by John Rogers (1648-1721), and carried on by the Rogers fam-

ily and other influential and prosperous families of New London, Conn., and vicinity. Among their beliefs, which were based on a literal interpretation of the New Testament, were: church separate from state, nonresistance, baptism of believers only, nonmedical care of the sick, and observance of no special Sabbath. However, until about 1705 they observed a seventh-day Sabbath, holding worship on Saturday and working on Sunday. This, together with other extraordinary practices, brought upon them many fines, whippings, imprisonment and confiscation of property. Their retaliation consisted in use of the "countermove"—they would enter the church of their "persecutors" during meeting and make public protests or engage in handwork. Aside from being extremely zealous in their chosen faith, the Rogerenes were good workers and excellent businessmen, respected by most of the townspeople. Under the Connecticut constitution of 1818, separation of church and state was, finally, accomplished. Religious liberty^o, the main purpose of the Rogerenes' existence, was thus realized. Because of this and because of much westward emigration^o, the sect dwindled in influence and numbers.

[J. R. Bolles and A. B. Williams, *The Rogerenes*.]

MARJORIE E. CASE

Rogers' Rangers, the most colorful corps in the British-American army during the French and Indian War^o, was commanded by Maj. Robert Rogers with such capable soldiers as John Stark, Israel Putnam and James Dalyell as lieutenants. The unit of 600 frontiersmen, serving as the eyes of Abercromby's and Amherst's armies, in scores of raids scouted enemy forces and positions and captured prisoners.

The Rangers took part in daring and bloody engagements. On Jan. 21, 1757, they cleverly escaped extermination by a greatly superior French force between Crown Point and Ticonderoga. The Battle on Snowshoes, fought to the south of Ticonderoga on March 13, 1758, did not end so well, for Rogers lost 130 of his 180 men and barely escaped himself, according to tradition by making the Indians believe he had descended the steep promontory on Lake George now known as Rogers' Rock. In 1759 the Rangers boldly wiped out the village of the Saint Francis^o Indians, and during the next year Rogers journeyed as far west as Detroit to receive the surrender of the French posts.

The great strength of the Rangers came from adopting the best features of Indian warfare. Each Ranger was an extremely mobile and highly self-sufficient military unit. He was clad in

buckskin and carried a smooth-bore firelock, sixty rounds of powder and ball, a heavy hatchet and a small supply of dried meat and biscuit. Extremely vigilant, the Rangers marched through the forest silently in single file with a cloud of skirmishers to the front and sides. In battle they fought from behind the heavy covert of shrubs and bushes. If outnumbered, they retired with slow, enchaing fire and, under cover of night, melted away in a hundred directions to the appointed rendezvous many miles away. Their dashing courage, incredible hardihood and humorous pranks made them famous alike in England and the colonies.

[Allan Nevins, ed., *Ponteach, or the Savages of America* . . . by Robert Rogers; Kenneth Roberts, *Northwest Passage*.]

EDWARD P. ALEXANDER

Roman Catholic Church. See Catholicism in the United States.

Roorback. A term originating in the campaign of 1844th when, in order to injure the candidacy of James K. Polk for the Presidency, a defamatory falsehood was published, purporting to be an extract from Roorback's *Tour through the Western and Southern States in 1836*; hence, any defamatory falsehood or forgery published for political effect.

[*Niles' Register*, LXVII, 73.]

P. ORMAN RAY

Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine was a policy of action by the United States in certain unstable Latin-American republics to forestall intervention by European creditor nations. Such action was allegedly a responsibility derived from the Monroe Doctrineth. The corollary was set forth in President Theodore Roosevelt's annual message of Dec. 6, 1904, and his special message of Feb. 15, 1905, with regard to Dominican customs control. Financial controls and interventions in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Nicaragua have been defended on this basis. After the World War the danger of European intervention greatly diminished, and since about 1928 the Roosevelt corollary has not been officially regarded as a derivative of the Monroe Doctrine. (See also Good Neighbor Policy.)

[J. Reuben Clark, *Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine*.]

BENJAMIN H. WILLIAMS

"Root, Hog or Die" was an expression originating in mid-19th century or before, based upon the hog's habit of digging for food; a typically American pioneer way of saying, "Work or

starve." Its grimly humorous meaning was that there was no place for the idler in a new, frontier country of limited means.

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Root Arbitration Treaties, THE, were concluded in 1908 and 1909, and remained the chief bipartite arbitration treaties to which the United States was a party until 1928 when Secretary Kellogg negotiated with France the first of a new type (see Briand-Kellogg Pact). Twenty-five of these treaties were negotiated while Elihu Root was Secretary of State and at least three, upon the same model, were concluded later. In general they obligated the parties to arbitrate differences of a legal nature and those relating to the interpretation of a treaty. Following the model of the Anglo-French Arbitration Treaty of 1903, they contained the sweeping exception of all questions involving the vital interests, independence, or national honor of the parties, or the interests of third parties. In general they provided that controversies arbitrated under the treaty should be submitted to a tribunal of the Permanent Court of Arbitrationth. Varying provisions were included in regard to the date of their expiration. Their ratification was approved by the Senate subject to a reservation requiring that the consent of the Senate must be obtained for the arbitration of every individual case under each treaty. The Senate's insistence on this reservation in 1905 prevented the ratification of four substantially identical arbitration treaties negotiated by Secretary Hay. Root, convinced that the Senate would not recede from its position, persuaded President Theodore Roosevelt to accept the reservation.

[H. M. Cory, *Compulsory Arbitration*.]

PHILIP C. JESSUP

Root Mission to Russia, THE (1917), was appointed by President Wilson in April, 1917, chiefly for the purpose of ascertaining whether Russia's active participation in the World Warth could be continued after the March revolution. The Mission was headed by Elihu Root, and included Charles Edward Russell, James Duncan, John R. Mott, Charles R. Crane, Cyrus H. McCormick, S. R. Bertron, Gen. Hugh L. Scott and Rear Admiral James H. Glennon. A Railroad Commission to Russia under John F. Stevens had already been appointed, and the Root Mission was specifically excluded from dealing with this vital problem. The Root Mission was in Petrograd from June 13 to July 9, 1917. The strength of Lenin and his radical group was not then appreciated by the diplomatic corps in Petrograd or by the Root Mission, and their con-

tacts were chiefly with the moderate parties of Prince Lvov and Kerensky. The Mission reached the conclusion that the most substantial service which the United States could render was to spend a large sum on propaganda to offset the strenuous German efforts to stimulate Russian peace sentiment. Their recommendations were practically ignored by the administration in Washington.

[P. C. Jessup, *Elihu Root*.]

PHILIP C. JESSUP

Root-Takahira Agreement, THE (Nov. 30, 1908), made by Secretary of State Elihu Root and the Japanese Ambassador Takahira, declared the wish of the two governments to develop their commerce in the Pacific; their policy to maintain the status quo and defend the open door^o and the independence and integrity of China; their resolve, reciprocally, to respect the territorial possessions of each other in the Pacific; and a willingness to communicate with each other if these principles were threatened. (An earlier proposal for such an arrangement by Ambassador Aoki, in October, 1907, had been repudiated by the Japanese government but the suggestion was renewed when the Katsura Ministry came into power in Japan.) The proposal was welcomed by the United States as helpful in quieting the widely held belief that war between the two countries was impending, a belief stimulated by the disputes over Japanese immigration and the anti-Japanese measures in California (*see* Japanese Exclusion Acts). The agreement was enthusiastically received in European capitals but did not please the Chinese who feared that it would strengthen Japan's position in China.

[P. C. Jessup, *Elihu Root*.]

PHILIP C. JESSUP

Rosalie, Fort, was erected by the French under Bienville in 1716, on the site of the present Natchez^o, Miss., to protect their trading post and settlement against the surrounding Natchez Indians^o. In 1722 it became the administrative center of the civil and military district of Natchez. The original fort was destroyed by the Indians during the Natchez massacre in 1729, but a new fort was constructed soon thereafter. It remained an important French post until 1763, when England gained possession of Louisiana east of the Mississippi (*see* Paris, Treaty of, 1763). In 1764 British troops occupied and repaired the dilapidated fort, which was renamed Fort Panmure^o.

[Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, Vol. I; J. F. H. Claiborne, *Mississippi, As a Province, Territory, and State*, Vol. I.]

WALTER PRICHARD

Rotation in Office

Rose Intrigue, THE. Because of Jefferson's embargo^o policy and Francophile tendencies, a strong pro-British party came into being, particularly in New England. Sir George Rose, the British minister, early in 1808, entered into an intrigue with Pickering and the Essex Junto^o to secure repeal of the embargo and to insure peaceful relations between the United States and Great Britain and thereby give new life and power to the Federalists^o. (*See also* Henry Letters.)

[Henry Adams, *History of the United States*, Vol. V; J. T. Adams, *New England in the Republic*.]

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Rosebud Indian Reservation, popularly known as Spottedtail Reservation, is located in southwestern South Dakota, and was established in 1890. It is the home of the Brule Sioux, of which Spottedtail was chief. The agency has grown to be a substantial and prosperous village. The total Indian population in 1936 was 6571.

[*Report Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, 1877.]

DOANE ROBINSON

Ross, Fort. *See* Russian Claims; California, Russians in.

Ross, In Re (1891). Interest in this case lies in the clear statement by the Supreme Court of three principles related to imperial growth: (1) The United States has jurisdiction over aliens on American ships in foreign waters; (2) it may exercise extraterritorial^o rights under treaty provision; (3) constitutional guarantees do not extend beyond our shores.

[M. O. Hudson, *Cases on International Law*; 140 U. S. 453, 11 Sup. Ct. 897.]

THEODORE M. WHITFIELD

Rotary Clubs. Paul Harris in Chicago started a club (1905) for the exchange of business and social relationships. It expanded in size and especially in ideas, and became the first of the service clubs, usually meeting weekly at lunch. An organization, with 16 clubs, was made in 1910, became Rotary International in 1912, now has International Headquarters in Chicago, with 5018 clubs in 70 countries, and about 209,000 members, with a code of ethics and service, and a monthly magazine, the *Rotarian*. Rotary's particular social service is crippled children and boys' work.

AUGUSTUS H. SHEARER

Rotation in Office. The theory of public employment which maintains that short terms of office and frequent changes in personnel are desirable is known as rotation in office. It is based on the premise that long continuance in office

leads the incumbent to become arrogant and unmindful of his obligations as a public servant. Opposition to a permanent civil service⁹⁹ is often placed on this basis.

President Andrew Jackson in his first annual message (1829) said, "The duties of all public officers are, or at least admit of being made, so plain and simple that men of intelligence may readily qualify themselves for their performance; and I cannot but believe that more is lost by the long continuance of men in office than is generally to be gained by their experience." Whether this statement arose out of sincere conviction or was merely a rationalization of Jackson's attitude toward political patronage⁹⁹ is difficult to establish (see Spoils System). It seems clear that the requirements of the public service in a technological age cannot be met adequately by any scheme which would deny the need for special preparation of employees and for conserving the advantages to be gained from their experience.

[W. E. Mosher and J. D. Kingsley, *Public Personnel Administration*; Luther Gulick, ed., *Better Government Personnel*; F. M. Stewart, *The National Civil Service Reform League*.]

HARVEY WALKER

Rough Riders, THE, was the most widely publicized single regiment in American military history. Recruited, for the Spanish-American War⁹⁹, from the cattle ranges, mining camps and from the law enforcing bodies of the Southwest, its personnel offered brilliant copy for the flamboyant, uncensored and unrestrained war correspondents of the era. Its commanding officers were the final touch. Leonard Wood, of the Army Medical Corps, left his post as White House physician to accept the colonelcy; Theodore Roosevelt became lieutenant colonel. Neither was trained for line command, but they had the fire of crusaders and colorful personalities.

The First U. S. Cavalry Volunteers, the official designation, had a brief training period at San Antonio, spring of 1898, thence it entrained for Tampa. There its horses were abandoned; and in the chaos of embarkation, but little more than half the regiment left Florida. The fragment that did reach Cuba lived up to its advance publicity. From Las Guásimas, after which Wood was promoted to a brigade, to San Juan Hill⁹⁹ their attacks were often unconventional but usually successful.

[Theodore Roosevelt, *The Rough Riders*.]

JIM DAN HILL

Roundup, THE. See Rodeos.

Rouse's Point Boundary Controversy. The Proclamation of 1763⁹⁹ set the forty-fifth degree

of latitude as the New York-Quebec boundary. Three years later Gov. Moore of New York, and Gen. Carleton of Quebec, assisted by Prof. Robert Harpur of King's College, determined where the line should run. Gov. Tryon of New York had it surveyed in 1771-74. The Definitive Treaty of Peace of 1783⁹⁹ retained the forty-fifth parallel as the United States-Canadian boundary between the Connecticut and St. Lawrence rivers, and in 1816 the United States commenced to build a fort near the border just north of Rouse's Point.

A new survey of the boundary, made in 1818-19 under the Treaty of Ghent⁹⁹, found that the true parallel was far south of Tryon's line. "Fort Blunder" was clearly on Canadian soil if the forty-fifth parallel was the boundary. In 1831 the suggestion of the King of Holland (see Netherlands Award), as arbitrator of the dispute, that the boundary should extend far enough north to include the fort failed of ratification in the United States Senate. The Webster-Ashburton Treaty⁹⁹ of 1842 retained the line of 1774, so that the site of "Fort Blunder" was within the American boundary. In 1843 a new fort, named Montgomery, was begun, but it was never completed or garrisoned. The ruined works were sold in 1926 and have since been demolished.

[New York State Report of the Regents of the University on the Boundaries of the State of N. Y.; D. H. Hurd, *History of Clinton and Franklin Counties*.]

EDWARD P. ALEXANDER

Rousseau's Raid (July 10-22, 1864). To assist Sherman's advance to Atlanta (see Atlanta Campaign), Gen. L. H. Rousseau was directed to assemble 2500 cavalry and destroy the West Point and Montgomery Railroad from a point opposite Tuskegee to Opelika. Rousseau left Decatur, Ala., July 10, and in the following twelve days completely accomplished his mission.

[*Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. IV.]

ROBERT S. THOMAS

Royal Colonies. With the exceptions of Connecticut and Rhode Island, all of the original thirteen colonies began as chartered or proprietary provinces⁹⁹—and those two exceptions shortly came to be chartered colonies. Governmental problems caused most proprietors to surrender their charters to the crown. Massachusetts Bay colony⁹⁹ lost its charter in 1684. The new form of government was known as a royal province, and began first in Virginia in 1624 (see Virginia Company of London). At the time of the Revolution only Connecticut, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island⁹⁹ retained the earlier forms of government. Thus the royal province became the standard type of colonial government in America.

In the royal province no legal limitations stood between the king and the people. The king was represented by a royal governor (*see* Colonial Governors), appointed and removable at will, whose authority rested upon a commission and a set of instructions (*see* Colonial Governors—Instructions). The first conferred authority, the latter directed how the authority was to be exercised. Together these documents constituted a written constitution, subject to change by the crown. The governor was assisted by a council of twelve, appointed by the crown (*see* Colonial Councils).

Each colony had an elected assembly (*see* Colonial Assemblies) representing the people, which had complete control over lawmaking, taxation, and the handling of public revenues. Most royal governors were dependent upon the assembly for financial support. This opened the way for extensive popular control of government in America by the assemblies, and by 1764 the royal provinces were quite fully self-governing commonwealths. Georgia was the only original colony supported directly by parliamentary appropriations. In 1767 the royal governors and other civil officers were made independent of the assemblies, and were paid directly from the American revenue.

Judges were appointed by the crown, usually for good behavior. After 1760 they could be removed by the crown the same as governors, and under the act of 1767 (*see* Colonial Judiciary) were no longer paid by the assemblies. All laws had to be sent to England and were subject to the royal veto^o. All unsold public land belonged to the crown and could be granted by the governor. The colonial government articulated with England, by way of the Board of Trade^o, in ordinary civil matters; with the Secretary of State for the Southern Department in major political affairs; with the Treasury Department in matters of customs duties^o; and with the Admiralty office in matters of admiralty^o.

[Leonard Woods Labaree, *Royal Government in America*.]

O. M. DICKERSON

Royal Disallowance. In addition to possessing authority to review cases on appeal from colonial courts (*see* Appeals from Colonial Courts), the Privy Council^o had the power to approve or disallow colonial legislation. By 1730 this applied to all the colonies except Connecticut and Rhode Island. Laws contrary to English common or statute law, to a colonial charter or to governor's instructions, laws manifestly inequitable or badly drafted, were principal targets of the disallowance procedure. While only a very small per-

centage of colonial laws were disallowed, the practice helped to tighten the mercantilist^o vise upon the colonies, as frequent objects of royal disapproval were laws affecting English trade and shipping interests, establishing debt moratoria and inflation, and fostering colonial manufactures.

[C. M. Andrews, *The Royal Disallowance*, in *Amer. Antiq. Soc., Proceedings*, N. S. XXIV; E. B. Russell, *Review of Colonial Legislation by the King in Council*.]

RICHARD B. MORRIS

Rubber was in use by natives of Central and South America, for game balls and to waterproof garments and shoes, at the first coming of the white man. It was introduced into Europe by Columbus. In 1770 Joseph Priestley, the scientist, mentioned that the substance was useful for "wiping from paper the marks of a black-lead-pencil," and thereby gave rubber its popular name. Although a satisfactory waterproof cloth was developed by Macintosh and Hancock in England as early as 1820, the effect on rubber of changes in temperature confined its uses to narrow limits. This obstacle was overcome by Charles Goodyear of Connecticut, in 1839, when he succeeded in devising a simple and inexpensive method of vulcanization through the application of heat to a mixture of rubber and sulphur. While this discovery immediately led to the utilization of rubber in a variety of ways, it remained for the development of the automobile^o, with the resulting demand for tires, to establish rubber as a major industrial commodity. Today, rubber is notable for the variety of articles, estimated at between thirty and forty thousand, in which it is used and for the predominance of a single one of them, tires, which absorbs about three fourths of all rubber produced.

The basis of the plantation rubber industry was laid when Henry Wickham succeeded in smuggling seeds of the *Hevea* rubber tree out of Brazil in 1876. As late as 1905, however, 99.7% of the total supply of rubber was wild, obtained chiefly from Brazil with Africa the second most important source. The expansion in output of plantation rubber after this date, and the absolute decline in production of wild rubber after 1912, reversed these proportions; wild rubber now constitutes a negligible proportion, averaging about 2%, of the total supply of crude rubber. The first rubber plantation company was organized in London in 1903. From half to three fifths of all crude rubber is now produced on plantations controlled by joint-stock companies which are chiefly foreign owned; the bulk of the

remainder comes from small holdings owned and operated by natives. Rubber plantations were established by Firestone in Liberia (1926), and Ford in Brazil (1927), but these are of relatively minor importance. The plantation industry is dominated by British capital.

The price of crude rubber has shown extreme variations, from over three dollars a pound in 1910 to less than three cents a pound in 1932. This fact, together with the concentration of the bulk of production in a small area in the British and Dutch East Indies, explains the attempts to control the supply of crude rubber. The first important control scheme was the Stevenson Plan, put into effect in the British East Indies in November, 1922. Despite considerable initial success, it collapsed in October, 1928, leaving the industry, as a result of heavy planting, in a worse condition than at the start. A more comprehensive control plan, embracing the Netherlands East Indies, was put into effect in 1934.

The United States has from the beginning occupied first place among nations manufacturing rubber. Its relative importance increased during and after the World War, in 1924, 75% of all crude rubber was fabricated in the United States. This lead declined sharply in subsequent years as other countries sought to become more self-sufficient, but the United States continues to consume, on the average, more crude rubber than all the rest of the world combined. Because of the advantage of an early start, even more than geographic location, Ohio produces over half the output of rubber goods made in this country.

[U. S. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Publications on Rubber, especially *Special Circular No. 1111*; W. C. Geer, *The Reign of Rubber*.]

CHARLES R. WHITTLESEY

Rubi's Tour. In accordance with Charles III's comprehensive program of revitalizing Spanish colonial defense, the Marqués de Rubí was commissioned in 1765 to inspect the northern military posts of New Spain. During 1766-68, he traversed the entire northern border, from Texas to Sonora, finding it subject to chronic Indian attack, especially by the Apaches and Comanches⁹⁹. In his report Rubí suggested a realignment of the *presidios*⁹⁹, the abandonment of the Louisiana border posts, and an exterminatory war against the eastern Apaches. Most of Rubí's recommendations were adopted in 1772, in the form of a "New Regulation of Presidios."

[C. E. Chapman, *The Founding of Spanish California*; H. E. Bolton and T. M. Marshall, *The Colonization of North America*.]

CHARLES EDWARD CHAPMAN
ROBERT HALE SHIELDS

Ruffner Pamphlet, THE (1847), included the antislavery address before the Franklin Society by Henry Ruffner, president of Washington College, Lexington, Va. Endorsed by prominent leaders, it was widely circulated and much discussed. Ruffner, although not an abolitionist⁹⁹, contended that slavery retarded the industrial and commercial development of his section and should be gradually removed. Frequently a subject of political controversy, the pamphlet was used in the Virginia gubernatorial campaign of 1859 to discredit John Letcher through his original endorsement of it.

[C. H. Ambler, *Sectionalism in Virginia*.]
HENRY T. SHANKS

Rule of Reason, THE, is a principle of judicial interpretation which might with propriety be applied to any piece of legislation, the purpose and intent of which were open to serious question. Actually, the application of the phrase has been largely restricted to the interpretation of the Sherman Antitrust Act⁹⁹ of 1890. This measure, either by accident or by design, was so poorly drawn that even with the passage of approximately half a century, no one has ever known precisely what it meant. If it meant what it appeared to mean, it would not only be unenforceable, but socially and economically unsound, and probably unconstitutional as well. In the effort to evade the latter issue, the Supreme Court in *Standard Oil Company v. U. S.* (221 U. S. 1, 1911) and *U. S. v. American Tobacco Company* (221 U. S. 106, 1911)⁹⁹ enunciated the rule of reason. Henceforth, as a result of this process of judicial amendment, the prohibition of "all combinations in restraint of trade" set forth in the act, should mean "all unreasonable combinations in restraint of trade." The Court developed and elaborated upon the concept in *U. S. v. St. Louis Terminal Railway Association* (224 U. S. 383, 1912).

[John G. Hervey, *The Anti-Trust Laws of the United States*, Charles W. Needham, ed., *Cases on Foreign and Interstate Commerce*; William H. Taft, *The Anti-Trust Act and the Supreme Court*; Harry A. Toulmin, *Trade Agreements and the Anti-Trust Laws*; W. W. Willoughby, *Constitutional Law of the United States*.]

W. BROOKE GRAVES

Rule of the War of 1756. In 1756 the French, because of England's maritime supremacy, opened their colonial trade to the neutral Dutch. This resulted in a notification by Great Britain to the Netherlands that Great Britain in the future would not allow neutrals to engage in time of war in a trade from which they were excluded in time of peace. The British prize courts enforced this dictum, since known as the Rule of the War of 1756.

During the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon, the neutral American carrying trade endeavored to circumvent and circumnavigate the Rule of the War of 1756 by taking French colonial goods to American ports and re-exporting them as American goods. In the case of the *Polly*⁹⁷, decided by British prize courts in 1802 (a war case actually decided in an interval of peace), it was held that this circuitous voyage, broken at a neutral port, did not constitute a violation of the Rule of the War of 1756. In making this decision the court did not consider the question whether the payment of drawbacks of import tariff charges when the imported goods were re-exported nullified the Americanization and made the exports subject to capture under the Rule of the War of 1756. In the case of the *Essex*⁹⁸, decided in 1805, after the renewal of the war, the British prize courts decided that payment of drawbacks on colonial goods re-exported by way of neutral countries nullified the neutralization of those goods and subjected them to capture and condemnation under the Rule of the War of 1756. This ruling was the cause of much diplomatic dispute between Great Britain and the United States.

[Samuel Flagg Bemis, *A Diplomatic History of the United States*; John Bassett Moore, *Digest of International Law*, Vol. VII.]

SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS

Rules of the House. Because of the size of its membership and the immense volume of business, the House of Representatives must of necessity impose drastic restrictions on the conduct and opportunities of the individual member. Its rules, although subject to perennial criticism, are a product of centuries of legislative experience traceable, through the colonial assemblies⁹⁹, back to the early parliamentary practices of England. While there have been occasional general revisions, they are for the most part an accumulation of rules, interpretations and precedents in force since 1789. Even Speaker Reed's drastic revision of 1890 retained unaltered twenty-nine of the forty-seven rules in force at the close of the preceding Congress (see Reed Rules, The). It should be remembered that the rules have objectives which are hard to reconcile: to enable the majority to execute its will and to protect the rights of the minority; to expedite business and at the same time prevent undue haste. As a natural result the rules dismay the newcomer by their complexity, give the veteran member a great advantage, and make the skilled parliamentary clerk a vitally important official in House procedure.

[De Alva S. Alexander, *History and Procedure of the*

House of Representatives; Asher C. Hinds, *Precedents of the House of Representatives of the United States*]

W. A. ROBINSON

Rules of War. See War, Laws of.

"Rum, Romanism and Rebellion." See Burchard Incident, The.

Rum River, Battle of (July 4, 1839). Provoked by the wanton murder of a Sioux near Fort Snelling, Minn., by Chippewa belonging to a party of 900 homeward bound from an abortive annuity payment there, a powerful Sioux war party surprised the Mille Lacs band of Chippewa, just above Anoka (Minn.), and killed seventy while losing seventeen.

[William W. Folwell, *A History of Minnesota*, Vol. I.]

WILLOUGHBY M. BABCOCK

"Rum Row." Soon after the beginning of the Prohibition¹⁰⁰ era in 1918, quantities of liquor began to be smuggled into the United States by water, most of it through the eastern and southern coasts. The boats, which stole into city harbors at night or landed their cargoes in lonely inlets, were called "rum runners." In the South, they operated directly from the West Indies; but farther north, along the New Jersey, New York and lower New England coasts, the larger vessels anchored or lay-to outside the three-mile¹⁰¹ jurisdictional limit, waiting for smaller, faster boats—their agents or customers—to transship portions of the cargo and make a run for shore. This chain of loitering vessels—former fishermen, freighters, private yachts, even an old Spanish cruiser among the rest—came to be known as "Rum Row." Speedy government gunboats, called "rum chasers," watched for the smugglers who tried to steal ashore, and some wild pursuits and sanguinary battles took place.

[Roy A. Haynes, *Prohibition Inside Out*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Rum Trade, THE, which began in the New England colonies in the 17th century became vital to the existence of a people unable to produce staple crops. The climate of Massachusetts and Rhode Island being unsuitable to such large staples as tobacco, which maintained the Southern colonies, agriculture was confined, there, to the subsistence farms. The lumber and fishing industries of New England were unable to find markets in England large enough to pay for the manufactured goods imported from the mother country. They were forced, therefore, to seek a market in the West Indies. Here lumber and fish were paid for by molasses¹⁰², the main product of the island. The manufacture of rum, from this molasses, thus became one of the earliest of the

New England industries. The rapidity with which this industry grew is evident from the fact that, in 1731, a million and a quarter gallons of rum were manufactured in Boston from molasses brought in from the French West Indies.

It was presently understood by the Yankee traders that the most pressing need of the island planters was for slaves. The more adventurous of the New England sea-captains were familiar with the African Gold Coast before the end of the 17th century. The celebrated "triangle," therefore: molasses to New England, rum to Africa, slaves to the West Indies, was a logical invention and maintained the prosperity of the Northern colonies through the 18th century (see Trade, Triangular).

These colonies, however, soon came into conflict with England through the rum trade. Yankee traders found it more profitable to deal with the French, Dutch or Spanish islands than with the English. First, Catholic populations formed a fish market; second, the sugar supply of the English islands was inadequate, third, the sugar of the English colonies was more expensive. In France, legislation designed to protect native brandy forbade importation of rum from the colonies so that most of the molasses supply of the French islands was available to the Yankees. The English Parliament attempted, in 1733, to limit this trade by imposing high duties on non-British molasses imported into New England. This legislation was the celebrated Sugar Act⁹⁷. It was consistently evaded, smuggling became an accepted practice and achieved an enormous scale. It has been estimated that, of 15,000 hogsheads of molasses imported into Massachusetts in 1763, the duty (9d per gallon) was paid on only 1000.

In this year the conflict came to a crisis largely because of the war between England and France. England attempted to enforce the Sugar Act by the navy, by the appointment of Customs Commissioners and by the Writs of Assistance⁹⁸, which are recognized as a cause of the Revolution. By this time, however, smuggling⁹⁹ was regarded by New Englanders as a patriotic exercise.

The rum trade was an important factor in the development of colonial shipping; it was partly responsible for the design of fast ships and for the skill of Yankee skippers.

[R. Burlingame, *March of the Iron Men*; W. B. Weedon, *Economic History of New England*; S. E. Morison, *Maritime History of Massachusetts*; *Journal of American History*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 3.]

ROGER BURLINGAME

Rumbout's Patent, was a tract of 85,000 acres located in Dutchess County near the present

town of Fishkill, N. Y. License to purchase from the Indians was given to Francis Rumbout and Gulian Verplanck by Gov. Dongan in 1682. Before the patent was issued, however, on Oct. 17, 1685, Verplanck died, and Stephanus Van Cortlandt became associated with Rumbout, Jacobus Kipp representing Verplanck's minor children.

[Frank Hasbrouck, *The History of Dutchess County*.]

A. C. FLICK

Rumsey's Steamboat. On Dec. 3, 1787, James Rumsey exhibited at Shepherdstown, Va., now West Virginia, in the presence of a crowd of spectators, a boat which was propelled by water forced out through the stern by a pump operated by a steam engine. Gen. Horatio Gates, Maj. Henry Bedinger and other prominent men who were present gave Rumsey certificates stating that they had had the pleasure of seeing his boat "get on her way, with near half her burthen on board and move against the current at the rate of three miles per hour by the force of steam, without any external application whatever." On Dec. 11 at another trial a speed of four miles an hour against the current was attained. Being without funds to carry on further experiments, Rumsey went to Philadelphia where, shortly after his arrival, the Rumseian Society was formed. In May, 1788, that organization provided funds for him to go to England to carry on his steamboat experiments. There, after suffering untold disappointments and hardships, he died Dec. 20, 1792, a few days before he was to make a public trial of his boat. The following February his boat made a successful trip on the Thames at the rate of four knots an hour. In 1785 Rumsey invented a water-tube boiler of the type employed today in the United States and the British navies and in various steam plants where high pressure is a requisite.

[James Rumsey, *A Plan Wherein the Power of Steam is Fully Shewn* . . .; M. P. Andrews, *Virginia, The Old Dominion*.]

ELLA M. TURNER

Runic Inscriptions. The discovery in 1824 of a runic record in Greenland, and the publication in 1837 of Rafn's mistaken attempt to read the marks on Dighton Rock¹⁰⁰ as a Norse inscription, led to an enthusiastic search for Norse relics in America. More than a score of rocks, from Maine to Virginia and from the Atlantic to the Pacific, have been credited with bearing runic inscriptions of the Vinland period. Some were provably fraudulent. Some were misinterpreted natural marks and stains, or unintended scorings by ploughs. Many were haphazard scribbles by colonial Indians. Only two of them are actually

in genuine runic characters. One, at Kensington⁷⁰ in Minnesota, is still in dispute, warmly defended by some as a true Scandinavian record of 1362 and confidently asserted by others to be a modern fraud. The other, on No Man's Land in Massachusetts, bears the name "Leif Eriksson" and the date M1. There are strong reasons for believing that it was carved sometime within the present century, either as a practical joke on the owner of the island or as an innocently conceived private tribute to Leif.

[J. H. Steward, Petroglyphs of the U. S., in *Annual Report Smithsonian Institution*, 1936; H. Hermannsson, *The Problem of Wineland*, E. B. Delabarre, *The Rock Inscriptions of New England*, in *Journal American History*, XXVI; Alleged Runic Inscriptions, in Rhode Island, R. I. *Historical Society Collections*, XXVIII; The Runic Rock on No Man's Land, in *New England Quarterly*, VIII.]

EDMUND B. DELABARRE

Rural Free Delivery (1896) was established to provide an extension of the postal service⁷¹ to a considerable part of the population living beyond urban limits. Although the "village delivery" system of mail to small communities, introduced in 1890, had been discontinued in slightly more than two years, it led to lively agitation for an enlargement of the system into thinly populated areas. In 1891 Mortimer Whitehead of New Jersey brought the subject to the attention of the National Grange, and within a few months he presented before a committee of Congress his proposal for free rural delivery of mails. Early in 1893 James O'Donnell of Michigan introduced into the House of Representatives a bill for rural mail service, but it was never brought out of committee. Through the influence of the state granges, the movement was kept alive. Two appropriations, one of \$10,000 in 1893 and the other of \$20,000 the following year, for this purpose were not immediately used, but were added to the \$10,000 made available in 1896 for experimental service, which in less than a year was opened on routes in West Virginia. The first complete county service was inaugurated in 1899 in Carroll County, Md.

The service grew rapidly. By 1902 there were 8298 routes, and in 1937 the total number reached 33,601. The latter figure, however, is considerably smaller than that of 1925, in which year there were 45,189 routes. The decrease came as a result of a policy of consolidation, made possible by the substitution of the automobile for the horse-drawn wagons, which was adopted wherever it would not injure the service. By 1930 the annual cost of the service exceeded \$100,000,000, but in recent years this amount has been somewhat decreased. In 1917 provision was made

for the extension of the rural delivery so as to provide service, if possible, for the entire rural population of the nation.

While the benefits of the free delivery of mail in the rural area are not limited to those engaged in agricultural work, its establishment may be credited to the farmer. It has diminished the isolation of rural areas. With the daily delivery of newspapers the farmer has become informed concerning markets, and has been able to receive other instructive advantages already enjoyed by the urban citizen. Undoubtedly the rural free delivery system was one of the many factors in bringing about the parcel post⁷² service seventeen years later. It helped to prepare the way for making possible the contact of the large mail-order houses⁷³ with their country patrons.

[Pao Hsun Chu, *The Post Office of the United States*.]

I. HOWELL KANE

Rural Life, Changes in. Rural life in America differed both regionally and temporally. We can distinguish an early period in northern agriculture, also a later period and a modern period. There was a pre-Civil War period in southern agriculture, capable again of being separated into the precotton planting age and the cotton planting age; also a post-Civil War period divisible into earlier and modern phases. We might add a western agriculture, mainly post-Civil War and modern, which was characterized on the one hand by the rise, progress and decay of cattle ranching, and on the other by a huge development in large-scale wheat growing which has persisted in certain localities to the present time.

Each phase of agriculture determined the rural life of its place and time. The North of the early period had a rural life conditioned by an agriculture conducted mainly on the subsistence level, with local variations toward a business type of farming. The subsistence farmer was engaged in maintaining a home and family through cultivating the soil of cheap lands. He was essentially an independent laborer, investing his labor and a little capital. He utilized in tillage also the working force of his family, but on the whole very little hired help.

The life of the subsistence farmer was therefore laborious and narrow, though since whole communities were similarly situated a democratic spirit of neighborliness relieved it of some of its harshness. Church, school, the neighborhood frolic, and occasional co-operative undertakings, drew people together (*see* Bees, Husking, Quilting, etc.). Also there was the primitive marketing, consisting in the exchange of farm products

for the merchants' wares; and meetings at the gristmill or the sawmill to promote incidental sociability. Hunting and fishing, while serving for relaxation from labor, had an economic value in supplying variety to the larder.

The growth of cities²⁰, through foreign and domestic commerce and through manufacturing, made new and better markets for agricultural products. In consequence, farming took on more and more the aspect of a genuine business which, all through the northern states, however, was of limited scope. The family-sized farm came to be managed with a view to financial profit instead of merely for the family's subsistence.

Toward the middle of the 19th century much attention was given to the subject of improved farming. The movement was promoted not alone by the favorable markets reached by means of better roads, river steamers, canals and railroads, but also by a new and more ample supply of farm labor, due to a heavy immigration of people from Ireland, England, Germany, Scandinavia, Bohemia, Poland, etc. Prevalingly of peasant stock, and with farming as their objective, these foreigners were glad to work on farms to earn money and to learn American ways.

The South, where a planting system based on tobacco, rice and indigo²¹ grew up during colonial times, had gradually come to depend on Negro slaves²² for its agricultural labor. With the rapid spread of cotton²³ planting, the slave system was greatly strengthened. Planting was a capitalistic form of agriculture employing large areas of land and numerous laborers, and its success depended on good management. Many planters were excellent businessmen, operating on a scale comparable with the greater merchants or manufacturers (*see* Plantation System of the South).

The life on the plantations, for the planter and his family, was often characterized by the most liberal culture. The planter had social and political contacts with leaders in his county, the state and the nation. He educated his children in the best schools and colleges, maintained a library, provided musical instruments for the home and cherished certain ideals in art and architecture. His mansion had expensive interior and exterior decoration. Lawns, gardens, trees and shrubs provided the setting for the home.

The planters could not afford to be indolent. The master was the manager of an extensive business, the mistress the manager of a complicated establishment. The slave population had to be looked after as well as made to work. They were divided, when numerous, into household servants, "yard folks," and "field hands." They

had to be housed, fed, clothed, medicated when they were sick, and buried when they died. The mistress organized the work of spinning and weaving, saw to the making of clothing for all the groups, and had chief oversight over the health and morals of the blacks. The master, with the aid of overseers and foremen, transmuted their labor into the crops which produced the family's income.

But the planter and his family enjoyed periods of relaxation. Vacation weeks might be spent in mountain resorts²⁴ or northern watering places, winter seasons in the cities, mingling with congenial members of their class, or engaged in political activities at the state capital or in Washington.

Planting, however, was only the most spectacular feature of southern agriculture. Small farmers of the yeoman class and socially retarded mountaineers were at all times far more numerous than the planters. But the small cultivators were largely influenced by the planting, slavery system to regard actual hand labor on the part of white men as degrading. Consequently, with many honorable exceptions, the small farmers of the South prior to the Civil War compared unfavorably with the untrammelled, hard working, but steadily improving small farmers of the North.

The war and abolition of slavery ruined most of the great planters and introduced a widespread movement to break up the plantations. In part, however, these were bought by capitalists and leased in small tracts. The prevailing system of leasing became known as "share-cropping," a means whereby the owner could get his land worked without direct and constant supervision. Share-croppers²⁵ are of necessity marginal farmers and, unfortunately, they have become very numerous. It is a population of poor people, white and black, who are ill-fed, worse housed, and largely ignorant, diseased and hopeless. The share-cropping areas are rural slums.

But there are hundreds of thousands of independent, self-respecting small farmers in the South; and a certain proportion of large farmers or planters, labor now being hired instead of owned. Farm life on the whole tends more toward the northern ideal than toward the old planting ideal. The depression of the cotton market in the 1880's and 1890's, and again since the close of the World War, seriously jeopardized the prosperity of southern agriculture.

Northern agriculture, tending steadily toward the scientific ideal, has prospered greatly in "good times." Consequently, farm life, what with labor-saving inventions, new means of locomotion especially the automobile, and good roads,

has come to parallel closely the life of towns and cities of which the farms are now practically the remoter suburbs.

[P. W. Bidwell, *Rural Economy in New England*; U. B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South*; Joseph Schafer, *The Social History of American Agriculture*.]

JOSEPH SCHAFER

Rural Post Roads Act (1916) was passed to provide for aid to the states by the Federal Government in the construction of rural post roads. Under the provisions of this measure, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to co-operate with the states in the construction of such roads. The term "Rural post road" was construed, with certain limitations, to mean any public road over which the United States mails were then, or thereafter might be, transported (*see* Rural Free Delivery). The measure carried with it an appropriation for the current fiscal year of \$5,000,000 which was to be increased annually until, for the fifth year, the amount available would be \$25,000,000.

I. HOWELL KANE

Rush-Bagot Agreement (1817). *See* Great Lakes, Agreement for Disarmament on the.

Russell, Fort D. A. *See* Warren, Fort Francis E.

Russell, Majors and Waddell. William H. Russell of Missouri and Alexander Majors, a Kentuckian, formed a partnership in 1855 and procured a contract for carrying government supplies from Fort Leavenworth[™] to the plains and mountain army posts, for which work they used about 350 wagons. The sending of an army force to Utah in 1857 (*see* Mormon Expedition) brought them a greatly increased business; they took in another partner, Waddell, and in 1858 they carried 16,000,000 pounds of government freight. To achieve this, they increased their equipment to 4000 men, 3500 wagons, 1000 mules and 40,000 oxen. When the Pikes Peak gold rush[™] began, Russell, against his partners' wishes, formed a partnership, in 1859, with John S. Jones as the Leavenworth and Pikes Peak Express[™]. The new company was soon in financial difficulties, and Russell, Majors and Waddell took it over. They also absorbed Hockaday and Liggett's stage line from St. Joseph to Salt Lake City, reorganized as the Central Overland California and Pikes Peak Express[™]. In 1860-61 they operated the Pony Express[™]. Their losses in these ventures were so heavy that they were forced out of business. In March, 1862, Ben Holladay[™] took over the Salt Lake stage line on foreclosure, and soon afterward, the famous partnership was dissolved.

[Alexander Majors, *Seventy Years on the Frontier*.]

ALVIN F. HARLOW

Russell Sage Foundation, THE, was established in 1907 by Mrs. Russell Sage for the improvement of social and living conditions in the United States. She provided a principal fund of \$15,000,000, which yields an income averaging about \$575,000 per year. In general, the Foundation seeks to carry out its aim, through the investigation of causes of adverse social conditions, for the purpose of spreading information useful to citizens seeking to ameliorate, remedy or prevent such conditions. It was created at a time when funds for the study of social problems were meagre; and its activities have undoubtedly been a factor in the increased attention given to social problems during recent decades.

The Foundation devotes a major part of its income to work carried on by its own staff. The chief heads under which these studies may be grouped are: charity organization and relief; child welfare; city and regional planning; delinquency and penology; family welfare; handicrafts; industrial and employment relations; recreation and community centers; remedial loans and consumer credit; social case work; social statistics; social surveys and community studies; and social work interpretation. It has published over 130 books and more than 200 pamphlets. Printing of books, pamphlets, measuring scales, forms, etc., now averages more than 200,000 pieces per year. The remainder of its income is granted to agencies with kindred purposes. Among types of activities assisted are: adult education; housing; training for social work; child welfare; improvement of country life; public health; race relations; and social research. Its headquarters are in New York City.

[*Russell Sage Foundation: Its Purpose and Activities—Annual Summary*.]

SHELBY M. HARRISON

Russia in California. *See* California, Russians in.

Russian-American Company. *See* Russian Claims.

Russian Claims. The creation of the Russian-American Company, in 1799, was the first occasion for Russia to define its claims to North American lands. The charter, granted by Paul I, established a monopoly of Russian-American trade and, of necessity, gave some indication of the territorial limits within which the trade could be carried on. These extended from 55° N. Lat. to Bering Strait, and included the "Aleutian, Kurile, and other islands situated in the north-eastern ocean."

That was only the beginning, for the company was empowered to make new discoveries to the

south as well as to the north of 55°. This privilege the company soon began to exercise, as well as an additional privilege of attempting trade with neighboring or attainable peoples, like the Japanese. It was soon learned that the great market for furs was at Canton, China, so the statesmen of the company, notably Count Rezanof, planned a great trade route which should embrace the Asiatic Islands, Japan, etc., and tie all in with the Alaska fur trade with Canton.

The problem of securing supplies for the Alaskan establishments, however, caused the Russians to look toward the Spanish settlements far to the South. Rezanof himself made a voyage to Spanish California in order to procure food for the Alaskans; and he was interested in making a farming settlement in the valley of the Columbia, but failed to enter the river. Finally, it was decided to plant a colony on the California coast above the Spanish settlements. Fort Ross, begun in 1809, at Bodega Bay, was intended as a supply station for meat and grain. No agreement was ever made with the Spaniards in regard to the California lands thus occupied; and finally, in 1841, the Fort Ross settlement was abandoned as no longer useful.

In 1821 on renewing the charter of the Russian-American Company the Russian government declared its authority would extend as far down the coast as 51° N. Lat.

The ukase setting forth that claim alarmed Great Britain and the United States, both of whose governments were by that time (1821) claiming territory on the northwest coast. In consequence, both these governments protested successfully and each succeeded in limiting Russia's exclusive claim to the southern line of 54° 40' N. Lat. The British-Russian treaty of 1825 also delimited the Russian claims from the coast inland, thus establishing the basis for the boundary of Alaska as granted by Russia to the United States in 1867. (See also Alaska Boundary Question, The.)

[Frank A. Golder, *Bering's Voyages*; J. Schafer, *The Pacific Slope and Alaska*.]
JOSEPH SCHAFER

Russian Fleets, Visit of (1863). In September, 1863, six Russian warships under Rear Admiral Lisovskii arrived at New York, and, in October, six more warships under Rear Admiral Popov anchored off San Francisco. The North warmly welcomed both fleets, believing that they came as possible allies. Popov, indeed, when a threatened attack on San Francisco by the Confederate raiders *Alabama*[™] and *Sumter* was reported, ordered his ships to "clear for action." On April 25, 1864, both fleets were ordered home. The

Russians did not come as Northern allies, but, fearing war with Great Britain and probable blockade, both fleets had been ordered to neutral ports, from which, if war were declared, they might make raids on British merchant shipping.

[F. A. Golder, *The Russian Fleet and the Civil War*, in *American Historical Review*, July, 1915; W. F. Johnson, *America's Foreign Relations*.]

LOUIS H. BOLANDER

Russian Orthodox Church in America. THE, made its first appearance in 1792 in Alaska[™]. Russian missionaries baptized a large number of natives and built the first Russian church at Kadiak Island[™] in 1794. Ioann Veniaminov, coming to Unalaska[™] in 1824, spent ten years among the Aleuts and prepared an alphabet and grammar of the Aleutian language; he went later to Sitka and built there one of the most remarkable Russian churches in America. A Russian church was built also in 1812 at Fort Ross (see Russian Claims) in California. In 1871 the see, under Bishop Ioann, was transferred to San Francisco.

Following the arrival from Russia of Bishop Vladimir (1888), there was a considerable development within the United States, partly due to the coming of Austrian and Hungarian Uniates (Orthodox obedient to Rome) within the pale of the Russian Church. Under Bishop (who later became Patriarch of all Russia) Tikhon (1898-1907) the see was transferred to New York. His successor, Bishop Platon (1907-14), later Metropolitan Bishop in the United States (1922-34), has greatly improved Russian Church administration in America. In 1936 there were 346 Orthodox churches in the United States and Canada, with some 325,000 followers.

[Petr Kokhanik, *Tubileiny Sbornik*, 1926-1936; V. Basanoff, Archives of the Russian Church in Alaska in the Library of Congress, in *The Pacific Historical Review*, March, 1933.]

PAUL HAENSEL

Russian Recognition (1933). On Nov. 7, 1917, the Kerensky government was overthrown by the Bolsheviks who, in the following February, annulled all state debts. Because of this and because of communist propaganda in the United States, the Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover administrations refused to recognize the Soviet government. President F. D. Roosevelt, believing that recognition would stimulate trade, invited Russia to send a representative to discuss the matter. As a result, he accorded recognition on Nov. 16, 1933.

[*American Year Book*, 1933.]

ERIK MCKINLEY ERIKSSON

Rust is a parasitic fungus growth, which attacks cereals and deprives them of nourishment. This parasite (known in antiquity) appeared in Massachusetts as early as 1660. Since then, varieties of rust have periodically ravaged agricultural crops resulting in the loss of millions of dollars. In 1796 state legislation was enacted for the control of this fungus. And some scholars have suggested that rust discouraged the extensive cultivation of cereals in New England. Recent epidemics of rust have been in 1904, 1916 and 1935. Since 1904 the Department of Agriculture^u has been active in developing techniques to control, and the cultivation of cereals to resist, rust.

[Percy Bidwell and John I. Falconer, *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States, 1620-1860*; U. S. Department of Agriculture, *Yearbook of Agriculture*.]

BENJAMIN F. SHAMBAUGH

Rustler War, THE, was a conflict centering in Johnson County, Wyo., between ranchmen and a large group of alleged cattle thieves or "rustlers," and their friends. Finding it impossible to stop cattle stealing or to secure convictions in the local courts, owing to the fact that jurors and county officials were either intimidated by the "rustlers" or sympathized with them, the cattlemen resolved to take matters into their own hands. In April, 1892, they brought in a group of hired "gunmen" from Texas, and organized an expedition of about forty-five men to hunt down and kill some seventy men who they claimed were known to be cattle thieves. The expedition first visited the K. C. Ranch, where two men, alleged to be thieves, were killed. The cattlemen soon met resistance, however, and took refuge in the buildings of the T A Ranch, where they were besieged for three days by a force of some two hundred men. Upon the request of the governor of Wyoming, the President sent United States troops, commanded by Col.

James Van Horn from Fort McKinney, to the scene of disorder. To these the beleaguered men, whose situation had grown desperate, gladly surrendered. They were delivered over to the civil courts for trial, but were all eventually acquitted. (See also Cattle Associations.)

[Robert B. David, *Malcolm Campbell, Sheriff*; Frank Canton, *Frontier Trails*.]

EDWARD EVERETT DALE

Rustlers. See Cattle Rustlers.

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., was chartered as Queen's College in 1766, the eighth of the nine colonial colleges. It had its origin among the leaders of the Dutch Reformed Church^u, and for many years was affiliated with that denomination. In 1825 its name was changed to Rutgers College, in recognition of the benefactions of Col. Henry Rutgers of New York. The New Jersey legislature in 1864 designated the Rutgers Scientific School the land-grant college^u for the state, and in 1917 further designated it as the State University. In 1918 the New Jersey College for Women was established as a branch of the University.

[William H. S. Demarest, *A History of Rutgers College—1766-1924*.]

CARL R. WOODWARD

Rutgers v. Waddington. See Trespass Act, The.

Ryswick, The Peace of (1697), ended King William's War^u. By its provisions all conquests made during the war were to be mutually restored; but the ownership of the lands lying around Hudson Bay was to be decided by an Anglo-French joint commission. Such a commission met in 1699, but failed to reach a decision.

[F. G. Davenport, ed., *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and Its Dependencies*, Vol. II.]

MAX SAVELLE